

MARRIAGE

MELVIN J. BALLARD
JOSEPH SMITH
BRIGHAM YOUNG
JOHN TAYLOR
ET AL.

BALLARD - JENSON
CORRESPONDENCE

"There is a mental attitude which is a bar against all information, which is a bar against all argument, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance: That mental attitude is CONDEMNATION BEFORE INVESTIGATION."

RIGHT WILL PREVAIL

However the battle is ended, though proudly the victor comes,
With flutt'ring flags and prancing steeds and echo of rolling drums,
Still Truth proclaims the motto, in letters of living light--
No question is ever settled until it is settled right.

Though the heel of the strong oppressor may grind the weak in the dust;
And the voices of fame, with one acclaim, may call him great and just;
Keep on with your weary battle against triumphant might--
No question is ever settled until it is settled right.

Let those who have failed take courage, though the enemies seem to have won;
If his ranks are strong, yet he be in the wrong, the battle is not yet done,
For sure as the morning follows the darkest hour of night
No question is ever settled until it is settled right.

O man bowed down with labor, O woman young yet old,
O hearts oppressed in the toiler's breast, and crushed by the power of gold;
Keep on with your weary battle against triumphant might--
No question is ever settled until it is settled right.

--Selected

I N D E X

Abraham--Plural Marriage, Law of.....	15
Amnesty--Petition for.....	47, 54, 82
Apostasy--Foreseen.....	72, 94
Babylon--Friendship of Decried.....	62, 82
Ballard, Melvin J.--Letters From.....	10, 14, 21, 23
Speech on 3 Degrees of Glory.....	7,
29	
Analysis of	
Revelation.....	24

Plural Marriage Wholly	
Wrong.....	79
Persecution	
Threatened.....	89
Advantages in Plural Marriage	
Cited.....	84
Existence of 1886	
Revelation.....	43
Cannon, George Q--On Priesthood.....	94
Constitutional Convention--1887.....	74, 75
Cullom--Bill Protested.....	55
Deseret News--Warns Against Surrendering.....	70-72
Grant, Jedediah M.....	57
Grant, Heber J.--Advocates Principle.....	58
Condemns Principle.....	89
Infallibility--Doctrine of.....	79
Ivins, A. W. Persecution Threatened.....	88
James--Epistle.....	63
Jensen, Esie D--Letters to Ballard.....	7, 12, 17, 19, 22, 29; 49
Jesus Christ--Obeyed Law.....	57
Kimball, Heber C--	
Condemns Those Denying Plural Marriage.....	41,
68	
Saints Living at Dying	
Rate.....	69
Monogamy	
Condemned.....	68
Kirtland--Apostasy.....	60
Lyman, Francis M--Powers of Congress.....	42
Manifesto.....	73, 78
Marriage, Plural--Committee Interprets Law.....	47
Church Accepts	
Principle.....	65
Cullom Law	
Against.....	55
Proposed State Constitution.....	74,
75	
Micah, Prophet--Revelation to Cease.....	93
Monogamy--Source of.....	57
Condemned.....	68,
69	
Official Statement--(June 17, 1933).....	53
Ordinances--Changed.....	90
Paul--Obeyed Celestial Law.....	57
Persecution--Threatened.....	88, 89
Pratt, Orson.....	66
Priesthood--Improperly Conferred.....	94, 104
Brigham	
Young.....	82
John Taylor on.....	94,
104	
George Q. Cannon	
on.....	94
Church Wanders	
From.....	76
Revelation--Ceased.....	93, 94
Richards, Franklin D--Power of Priesthood.....	77

Sarah--Law of.....	15
Smith, George A--Monogamy Condemned.....	69
Smith, Joseph--Early Persecutions.....	60
Interpretation of	
Law.....	39
Angel Threatens	
Life.....	38
Preach No Other	
Doctrine.....	79
Betray	
Revelations.....	80
Smith, Joseph F.--Interpretation of Law.....	36
Dangers Threatening Church.....	61,
94	
Jesus Lived	
Law.....	88
Breaks Rules of	
Church.....	89
Garments.....	90
Spencer, Orson--Shows Pattern of Heaven.....	34
Talmadge, Dr. James E.--Plural Marriage an Incident.....	7, 48
Member of Committee	64,
65	
Thumb, Col. Tom--Seeks Information.....	86
Taylor, John--Keys to Turn if Plural Marriage Rejected.....	83, 88
Revelation of 1886.....	43,
106	
Refuses to Sign	
Manifesto.....	73
Plural Marriage Greatest Cross	
Revealed.....	40
Apostasy	
Predicted.....	94
Woodruff, Wilford--Obey God Rather Than Man	40, 98
Asks Lord Concerning	
Action.....	77
Manifesto	
Signed.....	78
Why Principle	
Necessary.....	83
Young, Brigham--Interpretation Given.....	8, 40, 53
Flee from	
Kirtland.....	60
Pattern of Heaven.....	57,
61	
Church Not Fully	
Organized.....	62
Plural Marriage Necessary.....	8,
40	
Friendship of World Decried.....	62,
82	
Persecution	
Helpful.....	62
Church Wanders From	
Priesthood.....	76

of at least one woman to one man for time and for all eternity. Then do not get confused on that point and imagine that it necessarily means MORE THAN ONE WOMAN. It may be, certainly, but it does mean at least that one man and one woman are sealed together by the power of the holy priesthood by the sealing ap-[8]proval of the Holy Ghost for time and for all eternity, and then that they keep their covenants, before they will be candidates for the highest degree of Celestial Glory, and unto them only of all these groups of our Father's children is the promise made of endless or eternal increase."

As I read your statement, it carries the plain inference that the sealing of one woman--AND ONE ONLY--to a man "by the power of the holy priesthood and by the sealing approval of the Holy Ghost for time and for all eternity," completes the requirements of a Celestial marriage as contemplated in the revelation of the Lord to Joseph Smith, known as Section 132, D. & C. .

This position seems to be in accord with that assumed by the late Dr. James E. Talmage, who classed the principle of a plurality of wives as an incident, "never an essential"; also with the Official Statement of the First Presidency of June 17, 1933, wherein it is claimed that "Monogamous marriages for time and eternity, solemnized in our temples in accordance with the word of the Lord, and the laws of the Church, are Celestial marriages."

But this position does not harmonize with that clearly enunciated by the Prophet Joseph Smith and those who followed after him in the Priesthood. For instance Brigham Young made the bald statement that "the only men who become Gods, even the sons of God, are those who enter into polygamy." It is this class of men--who expect to become Gods, even the sons of God, and as such inherit the highest degree of glory in the Celestial heavens--I assume you had reference to in your remarks above quoted. If so your position and that of President Youngs, seems diametrically opposite. President Young's interpretation of the law of God on this subject, strictly accords, as I understand it, with that of Joseph and Hyrum Smith, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, Joseph F. Smith and many others of the leading brethren, and particularly those [9] who lived contemporary with Joseph Smith and who were instructed by him.

Why this difference? If your position is correct theirs was wrong. Reason and observation teaches that it is much easier to go through this life with but one wife than with a plurality of wives, and if there is just as much to be gained from it, why should any man in this day, insist upon having more than one wife? This is a point I should like to have settled in my mind.

We do know that "There is a law, irrevocably decreed in heaven before the foundations of this world, upon which all blessings are predicated--

"And when we obtain any blessing from God, it is by obedience to that law upon which it is predicated."

But the question is, what is that law as pertaining to the blessings of "eternal increase," by which men may attain to Godhood? In the maze of contradictions on this point, I am frank to confess that it is little wonder so many of the Saints today are unsettled in their faith; and it seems to me that you are in

a most excellent position to clarify the spiritual atmosphere,
by preaching the plain truth in the matter.

Am I wrong in my premise? If so will you tell me wherein I
am wrong? I humbly invite such enlightenment as you may be able
to give me. I feel there should be a common understanding on all
the principles of the gospel and every honest Latter-day Saint
should welcome the light of truth, though it brushes aside and
destroys the traditions of a life time.

Trusting I may have your views on these matters, I remain
Your brother in
the Gospel,

(Sig.) ESLIE D.

JENSON

[10] CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS
THE COUNCIL OF THE TWELVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

47 E. South Temple St.

July 21, 1934
Mr. Eslie D. Jenson,
Millville, Utah.
Dear Brother:

Returning after an absence of a week, I find your letter of
July 15, concerning a statement I made in my talk on the Three
Degrees of Glory, with which you do not seem to agree entirely.
I think my position is very clearly set forth.

I do maintain that the new and everlasting covenant of
marriage is not plural marriage but is the eternal union of a
man and a woman. That made it possible for plural marriage to
be. But to say that those who in the past have or in the future
will enter into plural marriage will be the only ones who shall
attain Celestial Glory is stating that which is not true. From
the very earliest editions of the Doctrine and Covenants until
the present in the preface to the revelation on marriage you
will find this statement: "A revelation on the eternity of the
marriage covenant including plurality of wives." So from the
very beginning the leaders of the Church have recognized that
the eternity of the marriage covenant stood apart by itself,
independent of plural marriage, but that plural marriage was
possible because of the eternity of the marriage covenant.

I grant you that there have been those in the past,
including some of the leaders of the Church, who have in times
of stress urged the brethren to enter into plural marriage and
have left the inference that plural marriage was the only
marriage that would obtain in the highest degree of Celestial
Glory. But there is nothing in the revelation [11] nor in the
actions and decisions of the Church itself that justifies that
position.

I have said many times that my father and my grandfather,
both of whom entered into this principle, were entitled to
special blessing but that special blessing is not the exclusive
right to enter the Celestial Glory. Because of having more than
one wife they are able to build faster toward the glory of their
own kingdom. There are blessings that obtain when the Lord gives

approval and permission for the practice of that principle, but those who pretend that there is no possibility of gaining that glory without plural marriage, as many are doing today without authority, and seek to enter into that principle, are merely climbing up crooked paths that will lead them into endless struggle and cause them to forfeit everything they have ever hoped for. I agree absolutely with the statement of the First Presidency issued June 17, 1933, from which you quote. I can see also some reason for thinking that statements made by men in the past in their enthusiasm would seem to conflict with it, but the statement of the Presidency today is in absolute harmony both with the revelation and with the actions of the Church itself.

Don't let anybody fool you into the idea that this so called plural marriage that is being practiced, some of it in your own neighborhood, is going to be valid. If you will read the 132nd section, you will find how the Lord absolutely stated that there would be those who supposedly would enter into eternal marriage but his authority would be lacking and they would not be valid. This is exactly the situation of those who are doing this today.

With kind regards, I am
Your Brother,

(Sig.) MELVIN J. BALLARD

[12]

Millville, Utah,

August 2, 1934

Elder Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East So. Temple St.,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Brother Ballard:

Your letter of July 21st, in answer to my inquiry of the 15th, is much appreciated. Since receiving it I have been out on a short vacation, hence have not had the opportunity of answering earlier.

You set forth with clearness your position, also that of the Church, on the very much discussed question of Celestial and plural marriage. I have been somewhat bewildered, as doubtless many others are, by the various interpretations placed on the marriage question; and since you speak of some in my neighborhood entering into plural marriage in opposition to the present rule of the Church, I feel that your instructions upon this point and your understanding of the Revelation on the subject, should be of vital importance to all concerned.

As I understand your position, the eternity of the marriage covenant as revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith, (D. C. Sec. 132), is fully complied with by the sealing of one woman to one man, under proper authority as indicated in verse 19 of the revelation, and that the only advantage to be obtained by entering into the plural marriage relation is to be "able to build faster toward the glory of their own kingdom," as you explain in your letter. This statement is quite clear. I can

understand too, how a plurality of wives even in this day, may be forced upon a person whose first wife has died and another is sealed to him for time and eternity, thereby providing two wives in eternity. In such a case, let me ask, is it to be understood that an advantage [13] obtains over the man whose first and only wife survives him and he dies a monogamist, assuming, of course, the sealing for time and eternity was properly attended to in each case?

My interest in this matter is simply to know my duty with reference to my attitude toward that principle. And there are some parts of the revelation I would like clarified in my mind and will thank you for your further comments on the subject. I will try and state them briefly:

First. Since Joseph Smith was inquiring as to why the Lord justified his servants Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc., in their having "many wives and concubines," and the Lord's answer was directed to that question; and since the Lord enjoined upon Joseph to obey the law he was about to reveal (verses 1, 3, 4), is it to be understood that the law referred to meant the having of more wives than one, as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob had?

Second. In the life of Heber C. Kimball, we read of an angel with a drawn sword visiting the Prophet, and commanding him to enter the law of plural marriage. Is this account credited in this day as being genuine?

Third. Just what is meant by the law commonly referred to as being the law of Abraham and of Sarah, as mentioned in verses 32-37. It seems in this case that God commanded Abraham to receive Hagar as a wife, he already having Sarah. Was the law of Abraham comprehended in the eternity of the marriage covenant, without reference to plural marriage?

Fourth. What is meant by the 64th and 65th verses of the revelation wherein it provides that a wife shall administer unto her husband, otherwise she is to be destroyed and he is to become exempt from the law of Sarah.

Fifth. Has the Lord given further revelation on this subject, as promised in the 66th verse? If so, is the information available?

Sixth. Is it the present view of the Church that the principle of plural marriage as formerly practiced will be restored, or will the fact of its being merely an incident to Celestial marriage permanently preclude its restoration as a Church tenet, especially in view of the present attitude of the world toward it? What is your personal opinion on this point?

[14] Seventh. Involved in the above question is the attitude of some whom I have heard state that the real purpose of plural marriage in the early day's of Utah's colonization, was to more rapidly increase the population; and that purpose having now been achieved, the original necessity for the practice has become obsolete Is this the view of the Church today?

Eighth. I have heard it advocated that Jesus Christ was married in the plural relation, to Mary and Martha, and perhaps others, and that such was necessary in order for him to comply with the full law. What is your thought upon

this question?

Ninth. With reference to the revelation of 1882, appointing Seymour B. Young to fill the vacancy in the Seventy's Presidency "if he will conform to my law." What is understood as being necessary to "conform to my law," as the Lord used the term?

I trust you will bear with me in this matter, and assist in setting my mind at rest on these and such other points as may occur to you as being involved. The present conflicting views upon these questions seem to be leading many of the Saints away from the Gospel as revealed to Joseph Smith, and for the benefit of some of my friends and myself, I shall be glad to have your comments on the points mentioned, and remain,

Sincerely your Brother,
(Sig.) ESLIE D. JENSON

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS
THE COUNCIL OF THE TWELVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

47 E. South Temple St.

August 14, 1934

Eslie D. Jenson,
Millville, Utah.

Dear Brother:

Answering your letter of August 2, will say that naturally if by plural marriage, as stated, there is provided [15] the opportunity to grow faster towards the establishment of the kingdom, and I am sure that that is the advantage, then the man who has had a wife die and has another sealed to him has two wives for the world to come and he does have that advantage over one who has but one wife. Of course I have always said that every man and woman should keep themselves prepared whenever the time comes, whether in this life or in eternity, to receive the fullness of the Lord's offering for growth and development, but should restrain themselves not to go faster than they are sent; otherwise, they may lose everything.

The law which the Lord was about to reveal to Joseph Smith embraced primarily the eternity of the marriage covenant, which was to be sealed to his wife Emma, but since it also included plural marriage, that too the Prophet was enjoined that he must prepare himself to receive and enter into. The statement in Heber C. Kimball's journal concerning the angel appearing with the drawn sword is not a matter that is in our own church history. While it may be all true, the church has not pronounced it authentic nor has it contradicted it. The law of Abraham unto Sarah of course was the law of plural marriage. However, you can clearly understand from the Saviour's answer to those who inquired concerning the status of the man who had died and left a wife and she was married by another and raised up children to the dead brother, that all this implied that there was, even in the days of Abraham, the eternity of the marriage covenant, for the dead man had claim upon the living woman and the children of that union be longed to the dead man, to whom the woman was sealed. But there also came the possibility of plural marriage because of the eternity of the marriage covenant to Abraham, and

under this the Lord gave Abraham the commandment that he was to receive Hagar as a wife.

[16] Your first quotation wherein the wife was enjoined to administer unto her husband the reference here is to plural marriage. When the Lord introduced it, it placed an obligation upon the membership of the Church who could qualify. The woman that could qualify and refused, certainly was under condemnation.

The Church has made no statement as to whether or not the principle of plural marriage as far as practice is concerned will ever be re-introduced. That is entirely in the hands of the Lord. He has made no statement on the subject. It is a true principle, always has been and always will be, though its practice is regulated by the commandment of the Lord.

Your seventh question, certainly, it was incidental that plural marriage did help to colonize Utah, but certainly that was not the prime purpose for which it was introduced because as I have already stated it is an eternal principle subject to regulation by the Lord.

The Church has not taken the position that Jesus Christ has plural wives. It is true that one of the early elders of the Church so advocated it but the Church itself has never made any such statement.

The revelation of '82, appointing Seymour B. Young to fill a vacancy in the Seventies if he would conform with the law, it meant the law of plural marriage because he had already been sealed to the wife that he then had. In those days when the Lord approved plural marriage, the leaders of the Church were expected to set the example. He was to become one of the leaders and should set the example.

I trust these suggestions may be helpful to you so you may clearly understand that as far as the principle of plural marriage is concerned, the Church has never re-[17]pudiated it, but so far as its practice is concerned, it has been suspended because the Lord has enjoined its suspension upon us.

Your Brother,
(Sig.) MELVIN J. BALLARD

Utah,

1934

Elder Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East South Temple Street,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Millville,

August 25,

Dear Brother Ballard:

I thank you for your letter of the 14th, which was in answer to my questions of the 2nd. Your letter sets forth clearly, as I understand it the attitude of the Church today on the question of Celestial and plural marriage. Since, as stated previously, the question is causing much controversy among members of the Church in their Priesthood and other classes, it is well, in my opinion, to have the points treated on in your correspondence made clear as you have so ably done.

Since writing you last some questions have arisen that I

should like further enlightenment upon if I am not trespassing too greatly upon your time, I trust you will bear with me in patience:

First. Is the law of celestial marriage strictly a law of the Priesthood, rather than a law of the Church; Joseph Smith having received the revelation and entered into the practice of the principle of plural marriage without the sanction of the Church? This question was recently asked me, and I did not feel fully competent to answer it.

Second. Assuming it to be a law of the Priesthood, is it not necessary that all receiving priesthood ordinations, believe the law of plural marriage.?

[18] Third. Is a member of the Church considered in good standing and entitled to partake of the sacrament, who does not believe in the law of plural marriage?

Fourth. I would like your interpretation of the law as it concerns the marriage covenant: "That you (the contracting parties) will fulfill all the laws, rights and ordinances pertaining to this holy order of matrimony in the new and everlasting covenant:" Just what are the "laws, rights and ordinances" as pertaining to this covenant which must be fulfilled?

Fifth. Since in the ceremony the "blessings of Abraham Isaac and Jacob" are sealed upon the contracting parties, through their "faithfulness unto the end," is it incumbent upon them to live the law of Abraham and the law of Sarah as pertaining to plural marriage in order to qualify and receive the anticipated blessings?

Sixth. In my last letter I asked: "Has the Lord given further revelation on this subject as promised in Section 132, verse 66, and if so, if the information is available." You doubtless overlooked this question. It has been suggested that the Wilford Woodruff Manifesto was the further revelation of the Lord as promised. Are we justified in assuming that view, or could the revelation of 1882 to President John Taylor be that further information promised?

Seventh. You stated that the law of Abraham to Sarah, pertained to plural marriage. What is the law of Sarah as mentioned in the revelation?

Eighth. Do I understand it to be your position that Celestial marriage is primarily marriage for eternity and that the only virtue to plurality lies in the possibility of a more rapid building of one's kingdom, or do you recognize in the plural marriage system a system of "breeding" that is superior to monogamy? In this connection I call your attention to a statement made by George Q. Cannon recorded in the Smoot proceedings in Congress: "The people of the world do not believe in breeding, but we do. So the people of the world will die out and we will fill the whole earth." Is this depopulation of the "people of the world" due to an inferior race brought about through monogamy? Is plural marriage a better social system?

Ninth. Please explain to me when and where and by what means did the Lord definitely suspend the practice of plural marriage?

[19] I trust in propounding these questions you are not lead to

the view that I am arguing for any particular understanding, as my object is to seek light and to be able to impart light to those who are asking questions on these various points. My prayer is that the Lord will abundantly bless his servants who are called upon to search out the honest in heart and lead them to their reward.

Sincerely your Brother,
(Sig.) ESLIE D.

JENSON

Millville, Utah,

November 13, 1934.
Elder Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East South Temple Street,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Brother Ballard:

Not having heard from you in answer to my letter of August 25th, and since we are having quite a warm controversy over the question of the necessity of living plural marriage even though contrary to the present teachings of the Church, I am again taking the liberty of calling upon you for information which I feel sure you can give me. The question being debated is,

Resolved, that to obtain exaltation in the kingdom of God it is necessary to live plural marriage. Since much of your writings and preachments tend to support the negative of this question, I shall be pleased to have the best you can give me in support of the negative for my use in the discussion. I realize that you must be very busy, and yet the importance to myself and others who are interested in [20] the question, of your definite views on the questions stated in my last letter, and especially on the point above mentioned, prompts me to make this further request; and for your kind consideration and answer I shall be very grateful.

Praying the Lord to sustain your efforts to teach his word, I remain,

Sincerely your Brother,
(Sig.) ESLIE D.

JENSON

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS
THE COUNCIL OF THE TWELVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH
47 E. South Temple St.

November 23, 1934
Mr. Eslie D. Jenson,
Millville, Utah.

Dear Brother:

Yours of November 13, addressed to Elder Melvin J. Ballard has been received in his absence.

He is visiting the Texas Mission at present and does not expect to return to Salt Lake until early in December. You state in your letter that you addressed a letter to Brother Ballard on

August 25, and that it has not been answered. I do not find such a letter in our files here. Perhaps it miscarried.

At any rate your letter just received will have Brother Ballard's attention when he returns.

Very truly yours,
Miss Jeannette

Hanks,
Secretary

[21]

Millville, Utah

December 5, 1934

Miss Jeannette Hanks,
% Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East South Temple Street,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Sister:

Your kind note of the 23rd ulto. is received, informing me of the absence from the State of Elder Ballard, and that my former letter of August 25, had probably not reached him, thus accounting for the absence of a reply to inquiries therein.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter referred to, with the hope that Brother Ballard will find time to enlighten us upon the points mentioned, in order that our friends here may be set right upon the subject mentioned. I am addressing you, asking that you will kindly call the attention of Brother Ballard to these matters, and oblige.

Sincerely yours,
(Sig.)

ESLIE D. JENSON

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS
THE COUNCIL OF THE TWELVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

47 E. South Temple St.

December 5, 1934
Eslie D. Jenson,
Millville, Utah.

Dear Brother Jenson:

I have a copy of your former letter to me which evidently was either misplaced or lost, and note your interest in [22] having more information concerning the subject of plural marriage. Of course I am very anxious to do everything I can to support the position of the Presidency of the Church on this subject and I would like to know just what use you intend to make of this information you are seeking. I know that you have in that community a group of people who are trying to promote in defiance of the position of the Church plural marriage, and for one I am certainly not in sympathy with them and would do everything I could to save them from what I regard as their error. I understand that your position is that you are trying to support the position of the Church, and I feel sure the position the Presidency takes is supported by all the precedents and

literature of the past, namely, just as it is stated in the heading of the 132nd Section of the earliest editions, that it is a revelation on the eternity of the marriage covenant, which is one thing, and including plurality of wives. The plurality of wives was only possible because of the eternity of the marriage covenant. A very careful study of the Section itself would support the position I am taking.

I should like to hear from you as to just what use you are going to make of this material and in what way I may help you to support the position of the Church.

Sincerely your

Brother,

(Sig.)

MELVIN J. BALLARD

Millville, Utah

December 25, 1934

Elder Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East South Temple Street,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Brother Ballard:

I have your kind favor of December 18, in which you ask my purpose in soliciting the information mentioned in [23] my letters, and proffering to do what you can to clarify the marriage question in accordance with the position of the Church.

I appreciate the time you are devoting to this correspondence and trust that I am not in any way intruding. True, as you say, there has been considerable agitation in this community over the marriage issue. In the midst of this state of affairs I am trying to the best of my ability, consistent with the information at hand, to sustain the position of the Church. The situation here is serious and demands more than I have at hand in order to be properly equipped to sustain that position. For this reason I have directed my correspondence to you, regarding you as the outstanding spokesman for the position of the Church upon this question.

Will you please refer to my correspondence and give me the best you have. I consider I am well within the limits of right in calling on you to enlighten me. Such information that you have given me and may yet give me, I have no intention of using in any other way than that which will contribute to the salvation of the souls of men.

Sincerely your Brother in the Gospel,
(Sig.) ESLIE D. JENSON

CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS
THE COUNCIL OF THE TWELVE
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

47 E. South Temple St.

December 31, 1934

Mr. Eslie D. Jenson,
Millville, Utah.

Dear Brother:

Answering your letter in which you say that you are anxious to do everything you can to uphold the position [24] of the Church on the question of plural marriage, I am offering the following suggestions in answer to your questions:

The law of plural marriage was not given as a law to the Church for everybody; it was destined only for those who were prepared and worthy to receive it. My own father, as a Bishop, told me that he had denied more men that privilege than he had granted.

As to your second question will say that while the Church does not teach the practice of plural marriage, so far as the principle is concerned it is a correct principle and every man holding the Priesthood ought to believe in that revelation as divine and of the Lord. The Church does not deny the right to take the Sacrament to members who do not profess their belief in the law of plural marriage. They do not ask converts in all the world to profess their belief in this principle before they are baptized because the Church is not teaching that doctrine. The Church itself has taken action against either the teaching or the practice of the principle of plural marriage, however, not denying its divinity.

Now on your questions Nos. 4 and 5, I should like to repeat what I have stated to you heretofore--that the position of the Church always has been that which is set forth in the earliest editions of the Doctrine and Covenants with reference to Section 132, namely, that it is a revelation on the eternity of the marriage covenant including the plurality of wives. This distinctly recognizes the eternity of the marriage covenant as one thing and the plurality of wives as another. In the fourth verse the Lord declares that He is about to reveal a new and everlasting covenant and then in the seventh verse it states what the conditions of this covenant are and it does not herein deal with plural marriage at all but it deals with the contract between a man and a woman married until death do they part, setting forth very [25] clearly that that ends their associations when death comes, but that the new and everlasting covenant provides for their eternal union. In no place here is the Lord discussing two women but only one man and one woman. And he also makes it clear that there is only one man on the earth at a time who holds the keys of this sealing power and that is the President of the Church. The fifteenth verse again states that if a man marry a wife--not two wives but one--and he marry her not by me or by my word then that covenant ends when death comes. The eighteenth verse again states it in the affirmative way--"if a man marry a wife--not two wives but a wife--and make a covenant with her for time and for all eternity, if that covenant is not by me or by my word, which is my law, and is not sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise, through him whom I have anointed and appointed unto this power, then it is not valid." And that is exactly what these folks are doing, making covenants with each other without the Lord's approval or the sealing authority of His Holy Priesthood.

And again in the nineteenth verse it states that if a man marry a wife and abide the Lord's word, by His law and by the new and everlasting covenant and it is sealed unto them by the Holy Spirit of promise then it stands. Then there follows

afterwards great and wonderful promises to that man and woman when they shall, these two, pass by the angels and the gods to their glory and exaltation and quoting again from the nineteenth verse, "and they shall pass by the angels, and the gods, * * * to their exaltation and glory in all things, as hath been sealed upon their heads, which glory shall be a fulness and a continuation of the seeds forever and ever." And that describes the special blessing which belongs to those who attain unto the highest degree of Celestial glory as set forth in the 131st Section. That refers to this new and everlasting covenant and only those who enter into it shall attain unto this power of [26] endless increase. Yet the promises made in the 19th verse of the 132nd Section--that any man or woman who enters into this covenant and is faithful shall attain unto this power shows very clearly that the Lord designed the highest degree of Celestial glory for one man and one woman who enter into this Holy covenant and keep their covenants.

The 20th verse holds before them the possibility of becoming even what God is. And all this is pronounced upon the one woman in association with the one man.

And after having set forth in detail the new and everlasting covenant of marriage the Lord then turns in the 28th verse to a consideration of plural marriage as it was practiced by Abraham and sets forth terms and conditions under which men may enter into plural marriage by reason of the new and everlasting covenant and receive added blessings and privileges through faithfully observing this law of the Lord. So as I said once before to you plural marriage would never have been possible at all had it not been for the new and everlasting covenant of marriage. But the new and everlasting covenant of marriage is the eternal union of a man and a woman.

There are blessings and privileges when the Lord gives approval to the practice to those who faithfully have observed the law of plural marriage, and that blessing is not the exclusive admittance into the highest degree of Celestial glory but a power to grow more rapidly and attain unto the glories and privilege sooner than one who has only the one wife.

But the whole secret of the matter rests with the Lord's approval and the approval of those who hold the keys of His Holy Priesthood. Any man or woman who undertakes to seize these blessings illegally and unlawfully shall find that they are null and void and they will find that they have forfeited all their rights and privileges through their self willed course.
[27] I find no serious difficulty with the statements quoted in the books published by those who are urging plural marriage at this time.

I notice no difficulty also with the statements made by various, of the brethren who perhaps in their zeal held up before members of the Church the plural marriage system as the only one that should obtain in the Celestial Kingdom. Certainly plural marriage when entered into under the new and everlasting covenant and approved by the Lord would grant admittance to the highest degree of Celestial glory according to those revelations that would apply to any man and one woman. I am not familiar with any additional information promised in the 132nd Section. I know of nothing further. The pretended revelation of President John Taylor never had his signature added to it but was written

in the form of a revelation and undoubtedly was in his hand writing; nevertheless it was never submitted to his own associates in the Presidency and the Twelve nor to the Church and consequently does not bind the Church in any sense. But still there is nothing in the revelation that the Church disputes because the correctness of that principle is set forth with emphasis, and the Church has never disputed the truthfulness of the 132nd Section when the right to practice that principle has been sanctioned by the Lord and the Church.

And if the Lord had wanted plural marriage to continue according to the interpretations some give of President Taylor's revelation, he would have allowed President Taylor to have lived and enforced it but He took him and raised up President Wilford Woodruff who was inspired to give the Manifesto that stopped the practice of plural marriage. This indicates that the Lord's approval is with the course of the Church.

I trust this may be helpful to you and assure you that my anxious desire is that those who are blinded by the argu-[28]ments of men shall have their eyes opened to see the sorrow and distress that is coming to those that are living now in wilful violation of the rules of the Church which is only a foreshadowing of sorrow and trouble that shall come to every man and woman who violates the rules and regulations of the Church and disobeys the counsels of heaven.

Praying that the Lord may help you to rescue some of them from their folly and delusion, I am

Sincerely your brother,
(Signed) MELVIN J.

BALLARD

Millville, Utah,

January 11, 1935
Elder Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East South Temple Street,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Brother Ballard:

Your kind letter of December 31st, is received and I appreciate your assistance in trying to clarify the subject under discussion. I regret, however, that from the study I have been able to devote to your letter, my mind is not settled and am somewhat disappointed at your seeming failure to reconcile the position of the Church with that of the Revelation and the interpretation the earlier leaders placed thereon.

In perfect fairness to you as well as to myself, I am giving careful consideration to your communication and hope to submit to you my views and the difficulties I am encountering within a short time. Meanwhile, please accept my thanks for your patience and time.

Your Brother in the
Gospel,

(Sig) ESLIE D.

JENSON

[29]

Millville, Utah,

January 15, 1935
Elder Melvin J. Ballard,
47 East South Temple Street,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dear Brother Ballard:

Referring again to your letter of December 31; after a somewhat careful study of your correspondence, in connection with the revelations of the Lord and the statements of the early Church leaders, I desire to present to you my reaction to some of the statements made by you. In doing this I want you to know that I am prompted only with a desire to get to the kernel of the situation and an understanding of the will of the Lord regarding his law on plural marriage.

It has been a pleasure to correspond with you and obtain from you, first hand, your views along with the position of the Church upon this much discussed and, I fear, greatly misunderstood subject. And while there appears to be a serious difference in our views, surely there ought to be a way of reaching common ground; and especially should this be true of those who are willing to be guided by the written word of God. Certainly no Latter day Saint will permit himself to be wilfully lead into error on any principle of the gospel, and it should be the aim of all to learn the truth and be guided by it wherever it may lead them. With this thought in mind I desire to review these matters and present my understanding, particularly where in it may conflict with yours.

Our correspondence began on the statement taken from your discourse on the Three Degrees of Glory, published in pamphlet form. In this discourse you stated:

"Those who are denied endless increase cannot be what God is, because THAT in connection with other things, makes him [30] God. The eternity of the marriage covenant ought to be understood by Latter day Saints clearly to be the sealing of at least one woman to one man for time and for all eternity. Then do not get confused on that point and imagine that it necessarily means MORE THAN ONE WOMAN. It may be, certainly, but it does mean at least that one man and one woman are sealed together by the power of the Holy Priesthood and by the sealing approval of the Holy Ghost for time and for all eternity and then that they keep their covenants, before they will be candidates for the highest degree of Celestial glory, and unto them only of all these groups of our Father's children is the promise made of endless or eternal increase."

My views on this subject, as expressed to you previously, have been that only those who entered into plural marriage relations and abided in the covenant pertaining thereto, could go on to "endless or eternal increase," which increase, of course, is necessary in order to be "what God is" as stated in your discourse. And this viewpoint has been strengthened by a more recent study of the revelations of the Lord in connection with your correspondence; but on the point of the practice of plural marriage being necessary to the achievement sought we

seem to radically disagree.

You do say:

- (a) That "plural marriage is a true principle, always has been and always will be."
- (b) That Joseph was "enjoined that he must prepare himself to receive and enter into it."
- (c) That "the law of Abraham unto Sarah of course was the law of plural marriage."
- (d) That the "Lord gave Abraham the commandment that he was to receive Hagar as a (plural) wife."
- (e) That the revelation of "1882 appointing Seymour B. Young to fill a vacancy in the Seventies if he would conform with the law, it meant the law of plural marriage."
- (f) And that verse 64 of Section 132 of D. & C., viz: "And again, verily, verily I say unto you, if any man have a wife, who holds the keys of this power, and he teaches unto her the law of my Priesthood, as pertaining to these things, then shall she believe, and administer unto [31] him, or she shall be destroyed," had reference "to plural marriage," as you state further: "When the Lord introduced it (plural marriage), it placed an obligation upon the membership of the Church who could qualify. The woman that could qualify and refused was certainly under condemnation."

On the above points we are at perfect agreement. But your position now seems to be that the only advantage to be had through compliance with this law, as expressed in your letter of July 21, is that "because of having more than one wife they are able to BUILD FASTER toward the glory of their own kingdom," or as expressed in your letter of December 31st, "power to grow more rapidly and obtain unto the glories and privileges sooner than one who only has the one wife."

If that be the only advantage, obviously men, especially in this day of uncertainty and distress would prefer going on to salvation in monogamy even though it should take a little longer to get there. This of course is the selfish view, as while monogamy would afford a means to a full salvation to men there would be many women deprived of salvation by reason of lack of sufficient husbands who are in the covenant, to go around. However, I fail to see why Joseph and his immediate associates, including wives, as mentioned in verse 64 above quoted, were forced to enter this principle or be destroyed, if the principle is not a necessary requisite to salvation; and if it was necessary for them in that day to enter it and live it why is it not necessary in this day? Has the law changed, or has God changed?

Before proceeding to examine your analysis of the fore part of Sec. 132, let me observe this: According to Orson Pratt and Joseph F. Smith, the revelation on marriage was given to Joseph Smith as early as, and perhaps earlier than the year 1831. However, it was not reduced to writing in its present form until 1843. In dictating the revelation it is assumed the Prophet recorded as much detail which [32] had been revealed to him as the Saints could be expected to receive and the world tolerate; and that the written document, taken in connection with the Prophet's interpretation thereof, is perfectly clear and easily understood. We must assume, I take it, that God will give no

revelation to his Priesthood of an ambiguous or uncertain meaning; but that all his communications may be clearly understood by those possessing his spirit and who are willing to abide in his law. Another point is, that the revelation as originally recorded was divided into twenty-five paragraphs or verses, instead of sixty-six verses as it appears in the current edition of the Doctrine and Covenants. This copious division into verses has tended to confusion rather than to clarify the subject. For example the first six verses in the D. & C. form but a single paragraph or one verse as shown in History of the Church Vol. 5:501; in the Millennial Star, Vol. 15:5 and in the SEER, p. 7. Treating this single paragraph as one verse (which cannot properly be dis-associated) renders the meaning entirely clear; whereas, in its division into six verses, it tends to confusion. Then again you state:

"From the earliest editions of the Doctrine and Covenants until the present, in the preface to the revelation on marriage you will find this statement: 'A revelation on the eternity of the marriage covenant including plurality of wives.' This distinctly recognizes the eternity of the marriage covenant as one thing and the plurality of wives as another."

It is my understanding that the revelation referred to appeared in the Doctrine and Covenants first, sometime in the seventies, but much earlier than that, in January 1853, it appears in the "SEER," page 7, as follows: "A revelation on the patriarchal order of matrimony, or plurality of wives." Quite a difference. This heading is in entire harmony with the subject matter of the revelation. Joseph had read in the Book of Jacob, wherein the Lord instructed that "there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife; and [33] concubines he shall have none." This, no doubt, because of the wickedness of the Nephites at that time. Not being able to reconcile this prohibition with the scriptural account of Abraham and others having many wives and concubines with divine approval, he put the question up to the Lord and received the answer as embodied in Sec. 132, the first paragraph thereof, embracing the first six verses, reading as follows:

"Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you, my servant Joseph that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand, to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; as also Moses, David and Solomon, my servants as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines: Behold! and lo, I am the Lord thy God and will answer thee as touching this matter: Therefore, prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you; for all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same, for behold! I reveal unto you a new and everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant, and be permitted to enter into my glory; for all who will have a blessing at my hands, shall abide the law which was appointed for that blessing, and the conditions thereof, as were instituted from before the foundation of the world: And as pertaining to the new and ever lasting covenant, it was instituted for the fulness of my glory; and he that

receiveth a fulness thereof, must and shall abide the law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God."

Clearly the subject matter of the inquiry and the answer thereto pertained to polygamy as practiced by Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, Solomon, etc. No "wresting of the scriptures" can make anything else out of it; and the heading as given in the SEER was a proper heading as expressing the subject matter of the revelation.

In your efforts to divide the section into two independent subjects the major one being the "eternity of the marriage covenant" between "one man and one woman," you are lead to analyze the fore part of the revelation to the twentieth verse, in a manner which, in my judgment, does violence to your intelligence: wherein you hold that because [34] the Lord said (verses 15 and 18), "If a man marry him A WIFE" it means "not two wives but one," and that "in no place here is the Lord discussing two women." Might as sensibly make Paul say: "A Bishop then should be blameless, the husband of ONE WIFE--not two wives;" and restrict the Lord's commandment not to covet thy neighbor's wife or ox, to one wife and one ox, because only one was mentioned, and no restriction is made against coveting all over one. The subject of the revelation was a plurality of wives.

The Lord was dealing with a specific question asked by the Prophet and which he answered just as specifically, and since the question pertained to plural marriage, the answer was rooted in that principle and in no sense restricted the thought to one man marrying only one woman. It appears clear to me, Brother Ballard, that you proceed in your analysis of Sec. 132 from a false premise, and for that reason the entire analysis is faulty.

Joseph's question, as indicated above pertained to the "principle and doctrine" of "many wives and concubines," and God proceeds in answer, to justify the ancients in such practice on the grounds that it is an eternal law, a heavenly pattern; an enduring pattern "instituted for the fulness of my glory." The Lord had previously promised: (Sec. 52:14). "And again I will give unto you a pattern in all things, that ye may not be deceived, for Satan is abroad in the land, and he goeth forth deceiving the nations;" Certainly if we are to attain to the glory mentioned, it can only be when we conform to a heavenly pattern. (Things earthly are typical of things heavenly). It is the only pattern that is "everlasting," and is A PATTERN not two patterns. Orson Spencer very lucidly puts the situation thus:

"When God sets up any portion of his kingdom upon the earth, it is patterned after his own order in the heavens. When [35] he gives to man a pattern of family organization on the earth that pattern will be just like his own family organization in the heavens. The family of Abraham was a transcript of a celestial pattern. This family order of Abraham was spread out before God and met with his entire and full approbation. And why did God approve it? Because it is the only order practiced in the celestial heavens, and the only peaceful, united and prosperous order that will endure, while man invented orders and devices will utterly deceive and perish with the using." (Spencer's Letters, pp. 193 or Celestial Marriage, pp. 8, 9).

The seventh verse sets forth the condition of this plural pattern, true, not specifically mentioning plural marriage, he had done that in the previous paragraph, and in this verse was giving the conditions and necessary authority to validate contracts pertaining thereto, clearly indicating this to be a Priesthood and not a Church office function as your correspondence would have one believe. (See Priesthood Items--Musser and Broadbent, pp. 41-44). Verse fifteen is a part of the fourth paragraph as originally printed and which includes verses sixteen and seventeen. This paragraph mentions "those who are worthy of a far more and an exceeding, and an eternal weight of glory:" i. e. those again who conform to the heavenly pattern. The eighteenth verse simply enlarges on that condition that relates to authoritative validating. The nineteenth verse speaks of abiding "in my covenant," and here it becomes necessary to examine the covenant made when married to determine what is necessary to abide in. In that ceremony the contracting parties covenant and promise that they will "fulfill all the laws, rites and ordinances, pertaining to this holy matrimony." (Mill. Star Vol. 15:214). Surely Bro. Ballard, we will not misunderstand the plain meaning of this covenant by saying that plurality is in no way related thereto. Then the contracting parties agree to fulfill this particular promise, and by failing to do so forfeit what is there given and fall short of "abiding." It is important to note also in this connection, that the marriage ceremony [36] contains the promise of the blessings of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, on condition that the contracting parties are faithful in keeping the "law of Abraham," which law, as you state, means entering into plural marriage.

True, as Joseph F. Smith said, the marriage of one woman to a man for eternity, by proper authority, is a "fulfillment of the celestial law of marriage in part, but this is only the beginning of the law and not the whole of it:" Said Elder Smith:

"Some people have supposed that the doctrine of plural marriage was a sort of superfluity or non-essential to the salvation of mankind. In other words, some of the Saints have said and believe that a man with one wife, sealed to him by the authority of the Priesthood for time and eternity, will receive an exaltation as great and glorious, if he is faithful, as he possibly could with more than one, I WISH HERE TO ENTER MY SOLEMN PROTEST AGAINST THIS IDEA FOR I KNOW IT IS FALSE. There is no blessing promised except upon conditions, and no blessing can be obtained by mankind except by faithful compliance with the conditions or law, upon which the same is promised. The marriage of one woman to a man for time and eternity by the sealing power, according to the law of God is a fulfillment of the celestial law of marriage in part * * * But this is only the beginning of the law, not the whole of it. Therefore, WHOEVER HAS IMAGINED THAT HE COULD OBTAIN THE FULLNESS OF THE BLESSING PERTAINING TO THIS CELESTIAL LAW, BY COMPLYING WITH ONLY A PORTION OF ITS CONDITIONS, HAS DECEIVED HIMSELF. HE CANNOT DO IT. * * *

"If then, this principle was of such great importance that the Prophet himself was threatened with destruction, and the best men in the Church with being excluded from the favor of the Almighty if they did not enter into and

establish the practice of it upon the earth, it is useless to tell me that there is no blessing attached to obedience to the law, or that a man with only one wife can obtain as great a reward, glory or kingdom as he can with more than one, being equally faithful. * * *

"Man cannot receive the fulness of the blessings unless he fulfills the law, any more than he can claim the gift of the Holy Ghost after he is baptised without the laying on of hands by proper authority, or the remission of sins without baptism, though he may repent in sackcloth and ashes. * * *

[37] "I understand the law of celestial marriage to mean that EVERY MAN IN THIS CHURCH who has the ability to obey and practice it in righteousness, and will not, SHALL BE DAMNED. I say I understand it to mean this and nothing less and I testify in the name of Jesus that it does mean that.
* * *

"The law is in force upon the inhabitants of Zion and he that is qualified to obey it cannot neglect or disregard it with immunity, but it must be obeyed in righteousness. The commandment is 'be ye righteous, be ye holy as He is holy.'"

This statement of Elder Smith is positive and it perfectly reflects the teachings of the Prophet Joseph and his associates. The statement was made shortly after the death of Brigham Young with whom Elder Smith had had intimate association. No doubt he received the information from President Young during the latter's life, also from such men as John Taylor and Wilford Woodruff, with whom he was closely associated. I cannot find any place where his statement has been officially refuted and, if true, it seems to destroy the premise you assume.

And this brings us to another phase of the subject--that of interpretation: Candor compels us to admit that the best interpretation of a law must come either from the law giver himself or from the person to whom the law was revealed. According to all accounts Joseph received the revelation with reluctance; it was opposed to his pre-conceived notions of chastity and marital felicity. It is reported that he even argued with the angel who appeared to him, and received the new covenant only after great mental suffering but not until he had been convinced that the kingdom could not go on without obedience to that law. Says the Lord (verse 28) "I am the Lord thy God and will give unto thee the law of the Holy Priesthood, as was ordained by me, and my Father before the world was." This "law of the Holy Priesthood," according to Joseph's understanding, was the principle of Patriarchal or plural marriage that Abraham had accepted and lived, and the [38] correct living of which, the Lord explained, was incumbent on every individual expecting "endless increase."

Speaking of Joseph's reluctance in receiving the new revelation on marriage, we read in the biography of Heber C. Kimball (pp. 333-9):

"An angel with a flaming sword descended from the courts of glory, and confronting the Prophet, commanded him in the name of the Lord, to establish the principle so long concealed from the knowledge of the Saints and of the world. That principle was the law of celestial or plural

marriage. Well knew the youthful Prophet the danger of his task. Well knew he the peril and penalty of disobedience."

John Taylor, speaking of the principle of plural marriage said: "If we do not keep the same law that our Heavenly Father has kept we cannot go with him." This is self evident, and the law President Taylor was talking about and which our Heavenly father had kept, was the law of Patriarchal or plural marriage-polygamy, the subject of the revelation Sec. 132. Brigham Young testified to this when he stated that Adam, a resurrected and glorified being, came down on earth and "brought Eve, ONE of his wives with him." The plain inference is that he left some of his wives behind, and clearly indicating that he had complied with the law, as President Taylor said it was necessary for him to do. In compliance with the law as revealed at that time Joseph took other wives. The Church Historical record (Vol. 6:233) gives the names of some twenty-seven wives he took, in addition to his wife Emma. Surely this act of the Prophet was not simply the result of over "zeal" or "enthusiasm" which you intimate in your letters was the case. You state: "I notice no difficulty also with the statements made by various of the brethren who PERHAPS IN THEIR ZEAL held up before members of the Church the plural marriage system as the only one that should obtain in the Celestial Kingdom." And also: [39] "I grant you that there have been those in the past, including some of the LEADERS OF THE CHURCH, who have in times of stress urged the brethren to enter into plural marriage, and left the inference that plural marriage was the only marriage that would obtain in the highest degree of Celestial glory."

What "times of stress" could induce the Prophet to unnecessarily invite the malediction of the enemy upon him and his associates? Do you wish us to believe, Brother Ballard, that in giving his life in the establishment of this divine principle, Joseph was censurable because of "over zeal," or "enthusiasm" or the "stress of times," causing him to go faster and further than the Lord intended? Joseph understood his duty and the results of its performance. He said:

"They accuse me of polygamy, and of being a false Prophet, and many other things which I do not now remember, but I am no false Prophet: I am no impostor; I have had no dark revelations; I have had no revelations from the devil; I made no revelations; I have got nothing up of myself. The same God that has thus far dictated me and directed me and strengthened me in this work, gave me this revelation and commandment on celestial and plural marriage and the same God commanded me to obey it. He said to me that unless I accepted it and introduced it, and practiced it, I, together with my people, would be damned and cut off from this time hence forth. And they say if I do so, they will kill me. O, what shall I do? If I do not practice it, I shall be damned with my people. If I do teach it, and practice it, and urge it, they say they will kill me, AND I KNOW THEY WILL BUT WE HAVE GOT TO OBSERVE IT. It is an eternal principle and was given by way of commandment and not by way of instruction." --Contributor Vol. 5:259.

I take it that this language is so definite and clear that it cannot be construed to mean the marrying of one woman to a man for time and eternity. Certainly there could be no objection

on the part of the enemy to such a marriage. Brigham Young was with Joseph Smith and received from him all the keys pertaining to Priesthood, including [40] Patriarchal or plural marriage. Certainly he was not deluded when he said, as quoted in my first letter to you:

"The only men who become Gods, even the Sons of God are those who enter into polygamy. Others attain unto a glory and may even be permitted to come into the presence of the Father and the Son; but they cannot REIGN AS KINGS IN GLORY, because they had blessings offered unto them and they refused to accept them." --J. of D. 11:268-9.

Here the Prophet states that men cannot even become "Sons of God" short of compliance with this principle of polygamy. That statement ought to be convincing. President John Taylor, also a close associate of the Prophet and in jail with him at the time of his martyrdom, should be expected to have a perfect understanding of the meaning of the marriage law we are discussing. He received his understanding, first from Joseph and, second from the Lord himself. He said:

"Where did this commandment come from in relation to polygamy? It also came from God. It was a revelation given unto Joseph Smith from God, and was made binding upon his servants. When this system was first introduced among this people, it was one of the GREATEST CROSSES THAT EVER WAS TAKEN UP BY ANY SET OF MEN SINCE THE WORLD STOOD. Joseph Smith told others; he told me, and I can bear witness to it `that if this principle was not introduced, this Church and Kingdom could not proceed, * * * When I see any of our people, men or women, opposing a principle of this kind, I have years ago set them down as (being) on the road to apostacy, and I do today; I consider them apostates, and not interested in this Church and Kingdom." * * * --J. of D. 11:216.

Could anything be clearer as indicating the absolute necessity of living the principle of plural marriage in order to become "what God is?" Wilford Woodruff was another of these eye and ear witnesses in the days of the Prophet. Speaking of the principle of plural marriage, he said:

"Again this testament which Joseph Smith left, contains a revelation and commandment from God, out of Heaven, concerning [41] the patriarchal order of marriage. The Lord has commanded us to have our wives and children sealed to us for time and eternity that we may have them with us in our family organizations in the resurrection, to dwell with forever in the eternal worlds, that we may have an increase of posterity forever in connection with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the ancient patriarchs. And God, our Heavenly Father, knowing that this is THE ONLY LAW, ordained by the Gods of eternity, that would exalt immortal beings to kingdoms, thrones, principalities, powers and dominions, and heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ to a fulness of celestial glory I say God, knowing these things; commanded Joseph Smith the Prophet, and ALL LATTER-DAY SAINTS, to obey this law, `or you shall be damned,' saith the Lord. Now, having obeyed the law for many years, the Congress of the United States, and the supreme judges of the nation, stand forth and say, `You

shall be damned if you do obey it.' Now, Latter day Saints, what are we going to do under the circumstances? God says, 'we shall be damned if we do not obey the law,' Congress says, 'We shall be damned if we do.' It places us in precisely the same position that it did the Hebrews in the fiery furnace, and Daniel in the den of lions. The enemies of Daniel counseled together and said, 'We cannot find any occasion against Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of God.' Our enemies have pursued the same course * * * and made it a law of offense to obey the laws of God. Now who shall we obey? God or man? My voice is that we obey God!" (Celestial Marriage, pp. 12, 13. Also Mill. Star, 1879, p. 242.)

I would like here to ask you Brother Ballard, if you consider the statements above quoted as coming from Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, Wilford Woodruff and John Taylor, the fruits of "over zeal and enthusiasm," in other words, out of time and place and an exaggeration of the facts pertaining to the law? Was it a case of, having got themselves in trouble by entering the principle of plural marriage, they wanted their brethren to be in the same fix? Another striking testimony from Heber C. Kimball, whose association with the Prophet was intimate. Said he:

"You might as well deny mormonism, and turn away from it, as to oppose the plurality of wives. Let the Presidency of this Church, and the Twelve Apostles, and ALL THE AUTHORITIES unite and say with one voice that they will oppose that doctrine, and the whole of them would be damned." --J. of D. 5:203.

[42] To change the meaning of a law, in my judgment, is to sink that law out of existence--to destroy it; it is "opposing the doctrine," as explained by President Kimball, and I greatly fear that the judgment mentioned by him will be meted out upon those who in this day are "opposing it" and trying to change its clear meaning. The late Francis M. Lyman struck the key note to the situation, saying:

"Congress may make baptism, confirmation, ordination, partaking of the sacrament, gathering, building temples, paying tithing and praying to God, crimes. If made so by law they would be just such crimes as polygamy and unlawful cohabitation are now. Do you say that Congress can declare all these innocent ordinances crimes? Yes, if it chooses to, but it would be an exercise of unjust powers, not derived from the governed. 'Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion.' Celestial or plural marriage was revealed from heaven to the Saints, through the Prophet Joseph Smith. Everybody knows that it is a feature of our religion. The U. S. Commissioners, in one of their reports to the President of the United States, declared that polygamy was as much a part of our religion as baptism for the remission of sins. What greater evidence can be required than has already been given, to show that plural marriage is a part of the religion of the Latter-day Saints? They have preached, published and practiced it for over thirty-four years, and are now enduring bonds and imprisonment for it. * * * If they (the Saints), were now to forsake his commandments, he would forsake them, and

they would lose all. No Latter-day Saint can afford such a sacrifice." --Contributor 8:39.

Again, I must say, it appears to me, those who are seeking to sink the principle of plural marriage out of existence, by robbing it of the significance accorded it by the Lord through his Prophets Joseph, Brigham, et. al. are "forsaking his commandments."

But I must proceed lest my letter be too long. Your observation that you "find no serious difficulty with the statements quoted in the books published by those who are urging plural marriage at this time," is comforting. I assume you have reference to such books as "Celestial Marriage" by Broadbent, and "New and Everlasting Covenant [43] of Marriage" by Musser. A careful study of these works has proven a material help to me in determining my faith in the principle of plural marriage and the necessity of its continued practice; and your explanations, though given careful and prayerful consideration, have only tended to more deeply cement my convictions. I say this frankly but respectfully and with deepest regret at being forced, by the logic of the situation, to take an opposing stand against the Church and many of my brethren, including yourself.

I am glad to have your testimony of the existence of the much discussed revelation given to President John Taylor in 1886. You say:

"The pretended revelation of President John Taylor never had his signature added to it but was written in the form of a revelation and undoubtedly was in his hand writing. Nevertheless it was never submitted to his own associates in the Presidency, and the Twelve, nor the Church."

Your statement is endorsed in part by the late President Anthony W. Ivins, who referred to this "purported" revelation as a "piece of paper," "written in pencil, and only a few paragraphs which had no signature at all." (Supplement to New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, pp. 15). Both of these statements apparently contradict the "Official Statement" of the Church of June 17, 1933, which statement you say you "agree absolutely with." The "Official Statement" speaking of the claims of a "secret and oath bound organization," (which organization I confess I know nothing about) indicated one of the pillars on which these claims rest--and a necessary pillar--to be the existence of the "purported" revelation to John Taylor of 1886, then the statement proceeds:

"It is alleged that on September 26-27, 1886, President John Taylor received a revelation from the Lord, the purported text of [44] which is given in publications circulated apparently by or at the instance of this same organization.

"As to this pretended revelation it should be said that the archives of the Church contain no such revelation, the archives contain no record of any such revelation, nor any evidence justifying a belief that any such revelation was ever given. From the personal knowledge of some of us, from the uniform and common recollection of the presiding quorums of the Church, from the absence in the Church archives of any evidence whatsoever justifying any belief that such a revelation was given, we are justified in

affirming that no such revelation exists."

Since the "purported" revelation is found to be in existence, though to be sure, not officially passed upon, it certainly seems to weaken that part of the "Official Statement" claiming it to be non-existent. But Brother Ballard, you make a point of this revelation not being signed by President John Taylor. Let me humbly ask, why should it be? As I understand it, it wasn't supposed to be a revelation FROM President Taylor, but was to him. It does bear the unmistakable signature of its author, Jesus Christ, who personally visited President Taylor on the occasion mentioned, according to reliable witnesses. Anyone in my judgment, possessing the spirit of the Lord and who are familiar with his revelations, will not mistake this as being anything but genuine. There are those still living who were present on the memorable occasion when the revelation was written by President Taylor and announced, September 27, 1886, and when, clothed by a halo of light, the venerable President stood in mid air above the floor while announcing the will of heaven regarding the principle in question. And as to the revelation needing the signature of the receiver there of, I have never heard of revelations received by the Prophet Joseph having his signature. Certainly those published in the book of Doctrine and Covenants do not show it. You also say the revelation was never submitted by President Taylor to his associates in the Presi-[45]dency or to the Twelve. It is a matter of record that one of his counselors, George Q. Cannon, was present with President Taylor at the time and had a perfect knowledge of the revelation. The other counselor, Joseph F. Smith, was in the Hawaiian Islands at the time, but was sent for, and the revelation explained to him by President Taylor shortly before the latter's death. Later, I am reliably informed, the revelation was discussed in meetings of the quorum of Twelve, but was neither accepted as a revelation to the Church, nor rejected. I believe there are members in your quorum now that can inform you on this subject in accordance with my understanding. But, as you say, there was nothing in the revelation "that the Church disputes," it is needless to discuss it further, except to emphasize the fact that the burden of the message which the revelation bore, was that the law of plural marriage must be obeyed by candidates for the highest degree of Celestial glory, and that God had "not revoked this law (of plural marriage) nor will I, for it is everlasting, and those who will enter into my glory MUST OBEY THE CONDITIONS THEREOF." This was in answer to President Taylor's question as to whether or not he should sign the manifesto prepared for his signature. As a result of that revelation he announced: "Sign that document--never! I would suffer my right hand to be severed from my body first. Sanction it--never! I would suffer my tongue to be torn from its roots in my mouth before I would sanction it!" (Supplement to New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, p. 59).

One statement in your letter of December 31, Brother Ballard, I regard as most unfortunate. It grieves me. It is this: "And if the Lord had wanted plural marriage to continue according to the interpretations some give of President Taylor's revelation, he would have allowed President Taylor to have lived and enforced it but He took him and [46] raised up Wilford Woodruff who was inspired to give the Manifesto that stopped the

practice of plural marriage. This indicates that the Lord's approval is with the course of the Church."

The inference that God could not depend upon his servant John Taylor to bring about the suspension of the practice of plural marriage had he wished it done, is, to my way of thinking, unjust and uncalled for; just as though the courage and integrity of John Taylor had not been sufficiently proven to the Lord to have the Lord prolong his life and continue to use him. He had suffered martyrdom in life and died a martyr; he would have done the Lord's bidding at any cost. You speak of the "Manifesto that stopped the practice of plural marriage." In one of my questions you overlooked replying to, I asked: "Please explain to me when, where and by what means did the Lord definitely suspend the practice of plural marriage?" You now say the Manifesto stopped it, but it did not. New marriages continued on long after the manifesto was issued and even after the statement of President Joseph F. Smith of 1904, and it is current knowledge that certain Church authorities claim to be instructed not to go back of 1910 in investigating plural marriage cases. I do know men holding responsible positions in the Church, who were married plurally since 1910. In this regard I should like to know if an "adulterous association" as alleged of those marrying plurally since the manifesto, can purify itself by lapse of time, and while the plural association continues? This is a fair question and deserves a frank answer.

Joseph Smith said: "If anything should have been suggested by us * * * except by commandment, or thus saith the Lord, we do not consider it binding." (Church History Vol. 3:295). Certainly, as I read the Manifesto, it did not come by way of "commandment" nor "thus saith the Lord." To me it has always seemed strange that the [47] marriage law of the Church should not have received a definite interpretation and standing until a few years ago. At the general Priesthood meeting held October 1927, President Anthony W. Ivins held up before the brethren of the Priesthood, the book--Celestial Marriage by Broadbent--just shortly before published, and stated in effect: "Everything in this book is true; the compiler has not said anything except to quote from records of the Church, and ask some questions on them. Along about 1920, shortly after President Grant came to the Presidency, a committee was appointed to make a careful study of the revelation on marriage and to decide just what Celestial marriage meant." Here President Ivins gave the names of some of the committee. I only remember the name of James E. Talmage. He continued: "The finding of the committee was to the effect that the marriage of one man to one woman for time and eternity, by proper authority, was celestial marriage in full."

It would seem that Dr. Talmage whose outstanding life's effort, as I have viewed it, had been to sink the revelation of plural marriage out of existence, had prevailed in convincing his brethren that monogamy was celestial marriage, contrary to the revelations of the Lord, to the teachings of the "first Great Prophets of this Dispensation," and to the solemn statement made to the President of the United States over the signatures of the First Presidency and Apostles, when praying for amnesty, December 19, 1891, wherein they said:

"We the First Presidency and Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints, beg to respectfully

present to your Excellency the following facts:

"We formerly taught to our people that polygamy or Celestial marriage as commanded by God through Joseph Smith was right: THAT IT WAS A NECESSITY TO MAN'S HIGHEST EXALTATION IN THE LIFE TO COME.

[48] "That doctrine was publicly promulgated by our President, the late Brigham Young, forty years ago, and was steadily taught and impressed upon the Latter day Saints up to September, 1890.

To imagine that Joseph Smith and Brigham Young did not know what that revelation meant; neither John Taylor or the dozens of other stalwart men who placed their lives on the altar in its defense, and that the Church had to await the advent onto this scene of action of Dr. Talmage in order to get a correct interpretation of the law! Dr. Talmage's contribution to this vexed question was:

"The Latter-day Saints were long regarded as a polygamous people. That plural marriage has been practiced by a limited portion of the people, under sanction of Church ordinance, has never since the introduction of the system been denied. But that plural marriage is a vital tenet of the Church IS NOT TRUE. What the Latter-day Saints call celestial marriage is characteristic of the Church and is in very general practice; but of celestial marriage plurality of wives was an incident, never an essential."
--Story and Philosophy of Mormonism, pp. 89.

I submit that making a thing an "incident" a "non-essential" is sinking it out of existence--destroying its real essence and life. And from all appearances Dr. Talmage is guilty of this thing. And Brother Ballard, the conclusion is irresistible, as I see it, that your training with respect to this sacred principle, is a result of your contact and close association with the same Dr. Talmage; and your sophistry and eloquence are now being employed in mis-leading the Saints of God, destroying the faith of the youth of Zion in a divine principle of the Gospel and robbing those of them who give heed to your words, of a chance for salvation. I do not want to do you an injustice, but I cannot help seeing the situation as I have expressed it.

In conclusion let me affirm my sincere belief that the law of plural marriage is strictly a Priesthood matter and does not concern the Church only insofar as the Church is willing to abide in the covenant. It was revealed to [49] Joseph Smith and practiced by himself and associates in the Priesthood over twenty years before the Church adopted it as a tenet. The Church might, as it seems to me it has done, reject it as a principle of salvation, but it can in no wise prevent worthy Saints of God from living it so long as His recognized Priesthood is on the earth possessing the sealing powers. Complete salvation cannot be attained with out this principle, and the living of it; and no church edict, however solemn, can prevent men, who are willing to assume the consequences, from receiving the blessing.

If I am wrong I again invite you to show me my error. My mind is still open. I love the Church; it has been life to me and mine; I love my brethren with whom I have had the privilege of mingling since my boyhood days. I am trying to keep myself humble and in condition to receive the Lord's direction and I

pray that the time may hasten when the "House of God" shall be set in order and the Saints once more enjoy the spirit of unity and love.

Please pardon the length of this letter. I have not felt able to place my position before you more briefly. I shall be pleased to receive and consider any further information or suggestions you have to offer and I humbly invite your criticisms of my position, and remain

Gospel,

Sincerely your Brother in the

(Sig.) ESLIE D. JENSON

Millville, Utah,

February 22, 1935,
Truth Publishing Company,
208 Atlas Building,
Salt Lake City, Utah.

Brethren:

The enclosed correspondence is self explanatory. You will note from the date of my last letter to Brother Ballard, [50] that considerable time has elapsed since writing it and no reply has been received. This forces me to the conclusion that he has given all he cares to--doubtless the best he has--on the subject.

In my anxiety to ferret to the bottom of this issue for the benefit of myself and many others who are not satisfied with the manner in which the question is being handled by the Church leaders, I am turning to you brethren for such additional information on the affirmative side of the question as you may have to offer. From the nature of the correspondence, Brother Ballard understanding that it would be used in a public way, in discussing the questions involved, I take it there can be no impropriety in submitting the information to you, as I am doing, for such use, in the interest of the establishment of truth, as you may see fit to put it to.

Your brother in the cause

of
truth,

(Sig.) ESLIE D.

JENSON
(cc to Elder Melvin J. Ballard)

[51] Editor's Comments

An attempt on the part of certain leaders of the Latter-day Saints to subjugate the principle of Patriarchal marriage by the monogamous idea, is justification for this pamphlet. The modernization of life seems to have taken hold of the "Mormon" rank and file until a once exclusive and "peculiar" people has so popularized its theology as to render it harmonious with the ideals and practices of Babylon.

The correspondence herewith submitted between Elders Eslie D. Jenson and Melvin J. Ballard is enlightening and will

doubtless be read with interest by the Saints. To avoid an injustice to either party to the controversy, TRUTH is reproducing the correspondence in full, thereby affording the reader the broadest latitude in his investigations of the question involved.

Were the subject of minor importance only, we might be tempted to submit it with the simple publication of the correspondence, but since the problem is a basic one, and vital in its relationship to human conduct, we are prompted to reinforce Elder Jenson's argument by some further amplifications and comments.

It must be patent to the careful reader that Elder Jenson has met the situation with a rare intelligence and a becoming humility, both of which presages the presence and assistance of the Divine Spirit.

It is the mission of the Prince of darkness to destroy light. In proportion as the principles leading to salvation and exaltation are vital, in like proportion are his energies directed to their destruction.

When Joseph Smith received the revelation on marriage and was convinced of its genuineness, he announced it [52] to be "the most holy and important doctrine ever revealed to man on the earth, and that without obedience to that principle no man can ever attain to the fullness of exaltation in Celestial glory." (Hist. Record 6:226).

Naturally God's greatest gift to man--the pathway to Celestial glory--could not help being attacked with the deadliest weapons within the command of Satan. Not to destroy this principle meant his own destruction; for light and darkness do not exist together; one must inevitably be engulfed by the other.

Speaking of the Lord's system of marriage being the target for the enemy of light to shoot at; this is only true in part, for primarily that which Satan is attempting to destroy is Priesthood, and marriage is but a law of the Priesthood. The "Mormon Hierarchy" is the object of Satan's wrath. Priesthood is God--being the power and authority by which he functions as God. Satan's work is to destroy God, by nullifying his laws, thereby setting himself up as God, as he attempted to do before Moses and again in his conference with Jesus Christ.

Little concern has Lucifer for any marriage system, except as that system upholds and strengthens the machinery of Priesthood. The ultimate end of Priesthood is the salvation and exaltation of man--to take him back into the presence of the Father and make him a joint heir with the Father and the Son; and the principle of Patriarchal or celestial marriage--marriage for time and eternity, from which "endless increase" ensues, is one of the main channels through which this result may be achieved. And this is the reason the "Mormon" marriage system has stirred up so much antagonism. Let this system be destroyed by adopting the pagan idea--Monogamy--and salvation's main pillar is thrown to the ground.

Elder Ballard holds that Celestial marriage may be fully consummated by a monogamous union. This is also [53] the position of the Church as expressed in its "Official Statement" of June 17, 1933. It says:

"Celestial marriage--that is, marriage for time and

eternity--and polygamous or plural marriage are not synonymous terms. Monogamous marriages for time and eternity, solemnized in our temples in accordance with the word of the Lord and the laws of the Church, ARE CELESTIAL MARRIAGES."

Elder Jenson on the contrary holds, and properly so, that the interpretation of Celestial marriage as given by the Prophet Joseph Smith and his associates, makes plural marriage a necessary element thereof, the two being synonymous. The position of Elder Jenson, as expressed in his correspondence with Elder Ballard, is that the best interpretation of any law must come from the law giver himself or from the man to whom the law is first revealed. While this is a self-evident fact Elder Ballard attributes the plural marriage part, as given by the early leaders, as the result of "zeal", "enthusiasm" and "times of stress", causing the "leaders of the Church to urge the brethren to enter into plural marriage, leaving the inference that plural marriage was the only marriage that would obtain in the highest degree of celestial glory." Certainly the "leaders of the Church" did leave this inference, and not only an inference, but they so stated it in plain English. Elder Jenson's position is correct. It is a wicked assumption on the part of Elder Ballard and the Church, to hold that Joseph Smith and his associates, in interpreting the law of Celestial marriage were prompted by any other source than that of heaven, and certainly Elder Ballard will not venture to say that Heaven did not know what its order of marriage comprehended.

Brigham Young gave this very clear explanation on the question involved:

"When revelations are given through an individual appointed to receive them, they are given to the understandings of the [54] people. These revelations, after a lapse of years, become mystified to those who were not personally acquainted with the circumstances at the time they were given." --(J. of D. 3:333.)

This is both reasonable and sound. We are probably not out of the way in assuming that after a "lapse of years" and being overshadowed by a stronger intellectuality--that of Dr. James E. Talmage--the mind of Elder Ballard has "become mystified," since he was "not personally acquainted with the circumstances at the time" the revelation on plural marriage was given; and also, since in order to popularize the Mormon religion, it became necessary that the law be "sunk out of existence."

On the question of interpretation, Elder Jenson shows clearly by the petition of the First Presidency and the Quorum of Twelve, to the President of the United States for amnesty, the interpretation of Joseph Smith was still that of the brethren in 1891. They say:

"We formerly taught to our people that polygamy or Celestial marriage (synonymous terms) as commanded by God through Joseph Smith was right: THAT IT WAS A NECESSITY TO MAN'S HIGHEST EXALTATION IN THE LIFE TO COME."

If this was the teaching then, and it was in Joseph's day also--and in the days of Brigham Young and John Taylor--why TEACH DIFFERENTLY NOW? Has an eternal law changed? WE INVITE AN ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION.

Previous to 1891 when the above statement was made on March

31, 1870--a mass meeting was held in the Tabernacle to protest the passage of the Cullom anti-polygamy bill. The meeting was presided over by Daniel H. Wells of the First Presidency of the Church, and the following brethren were elected Vice Presidents: J. M. Bernhisel, Wilford Woodruff, John Taylor, George Q. Cannon, Orson Pratt, Joseph F. Smith and Joseph A. Young. A committee of thirteen was appointed to prepare resolutions of protest [55] to be presented to Congress. These resolutions were read by George Q. Cannon and were unanimously adopted by the large congregation of Saints "filling every seat and window" of the tabernacle. The resolutions were, in part, as follows:

First, RESOLVED, that the Supreme Ruler of the universe has the right to command man in the concerns of life, and that it is man's duty to obey.

Second, WHEREAS, according to the POSITIVE KNOWLEDGE of a large number of persons now assembled, the doctrine of celestial marriage, or PLURALITY OF WIVES (synonymous terms), was revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith, and by him established in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as a REVEALED LAW OF GOD; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that we, the members of said Church, in general mass meeting assembled, do now most earnestly and solemnly declare before ALMIGHTY GOD that we hold that said order of marriage (plural marriage) is A CARDINAL PRINCIPLE OF OUR RELIGIOUS FAITH, affecting us not only for time, but for all eternity, and as sacred and binding as ANY OTHER PRINCIPLE of the holy gospel of the Son of God.

Third, RESOLVED, that celestial marriage, or plurality of wives, is that principle of our holy religion which confers on man the power of ENDLESS LIVES or eternal increase, and is therefore beyond the perview of legislative enactment; the woman being married to the man for all eternity by authority of the Holy Priesthood, delegated from God to him."

We now give excerpts from the "Remonstrance," following the resolutions:

"Gentlemen of the Senate and House of Representatives: Of the one hundred and fifty thousand estimated population of the Territory of Utah, it is well known that all except from five to ten thousand are members of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints, usually called 'Mormons.' These are essentially 'the people' of this territory; * * And we * * are believers in the principle of plural marriage or polygamy, not simply as an elevating social relationship and a preventative of many terrible evils which afflict our race; but as a principle revealed by God, underlying our very HOPE OF ETERNAL SALVATION and happiness in heaven. * * * The revelation commanding the principle of [56] plural marriage, given by God through Joseph Smith to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints, in its first paragraph has the following:

'Behold, I reveal unto you a new and everlasting covenant and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no man can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory.'

"It (the Cullom law) gives no alternative but the cruel one of REJECTING GOD'S COMMAND AND ABJURING OUR

RELIGION, or disobeying the authority of the government we desire to honor and respect.

"It is in direct violation of the first amendment to the constitution, which declares that `Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.'" --(See Deseret News issue of March 31, 1870).

Here it is shown in unmistakable language that the understanding of the First Presidency of the Church and the Quorum of Apostles and First Seven Presidents of Seventy (all of whom were named officially in the actions above set forth), including the Church as a body, was that the Celestial law of marriage included as a necessary part thereof plural marriage or polygamy--Celestial marriage and plural marriage being synonymous, and that that doctrine was a "Cardinal principle of our religious faith," conferring upon men the power of "endless lives or eternal increase" obtainable only through a plurality of wives. The clearness of this statement leaves not a shadow of doubt as to the meaning of the law of Celestial marriage in the minds of these brethren; so clear in fact that even Elder Ballard, with his intense prejudice, must understand it, and which we trust he will not ascribe to over "zealousness" "enthusiasm" or "times of stress."

God's system of marriage, as it has always existed and always will exist, throughout His innumerable creations, is the patriarchal or plural form, while Satan's system is Monogamy for the masses, with Celibacy for the Clergy. [57] Sustaining this thought Brigham Young has furnished us with the following illuminating facts:

Source of Monogamy

"Monogamy, or restrictions by law to one wife, is no part of the economy of heaven among men. Such a system was commenced by the founders of the Roman Empire. That empire was founded on the banks of the Tiber by wandering brigands. When these robbers founded the city of Rome, it was evident to them that their success in attaining a balance of power with their neighbors, depended upon introducing females into their body politic, so they stole them from the Sabines, who were near neighbors. The scarcity of women gave existence to laws restricting one wife to one man. Rome became the mistress of the world, and introduced this order of monogamy wherever her sway was acknowledged. Thus this monogamous order of marriage, so esteemed by modern Christians as a holy sacrament and divine institution, is nothing but a system established by a set of robbers. * * * Why do we believe in and practice polygamy? Because the Lord introduced it to his servants in a revelation given to Joseph Smith, and the Lord's servants have always practiced it. `AND IS THAT RELIGION POPULAR IN HEAVEN?' IT IS THE ONLY POPULAR RELIGION THERE, for this is the religion of Abraham and, unless we do the works of Abraham, we are not Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise." --(J. of D. 9:322).

Surely there can be no doubt as to the meaning of President Young's statement that "plural marriage is the ONLY POPULAR

RELIGION IN HEAVEN," and the only religion by which men may become "Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise."

Upholding the above position and that Jesus Christ and his apostles lived God's law of marriage and for which persecution was heaped upon them, Elder Jedediah M. Grant, of the First Presidency of the Church, gave out the following interesting information:

Jesus Christ a Polygamist

"What does old Celsus say, who was a physician in the first century, whose medical works are esteemed very highly at the present time. His works on theology were burned with fire by [58] the Catholics, they were so shocked at what they called their impiety. Celsus was a heathen philosopher, and what does he say upon the subject of Christ and his apostles, and their belief? He says, 'The grand reason why the Gentiles and philosophers of his school persecuted Jesus Christ, was, because he had so many wives; there were Elizabeth, and Mary, and a host of others that followed him.' After Jesus went from this stage of action the apostles followed the example of their Master. For instance, John the beloved disciple, writes in his second epistle, 'Unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth.' Again, he says, having many things to write unto you (or communicate), I would not write with paper and ink: But I trust to come unto you, and speak face to face, that our joy may be full.' Again, 'The children of thy elect sister greet thee.' This ancient philosopher says they were both John's wives. Paul says: 'Mine answer to them that do examine me is this:--Have we not power to lead about a sister wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas.' He, according to Celsus, had a numerous train of wives.

"The grand reason of the burst of public sentiment in anathemas upon Christ and his disciples, causing his crucifixion, was evidently based upon polygamy, according to the testimony of the philosophers who rose in that age. A belief in the doctrine of a plurality of wives caused the persecution of Jesus and his followers." --(J. of D. 1:345-6).

Elder Heber J. Grant, now President of the Church, doubtless understood the law of Celestial marriage to include, as a necessary requisite, a plurality of wives, when he spoke upon this subject in 1885. The question as to the duty of the Saints with reference to the laws proscribing the living of plural marriage was under discussion. Said he, in part:

"No matter what restrictions we may be placed under by men, our only consistent course is to keep the Commandments of God. We should, in this regard, place ourselves in the same position as that of the THREE HEBREWS WHO WERE CAST IN TO THE FIERY FURNACE. If we are living in the light of the Gospel we have a testimony of the truth, and we have but ONE choice, that is to abide in the LAW OF GOD, no matter as to the consequences. It is sometimes held that the Saints are in error because so many are opposed to them. But when people know they are right it is WRONG for them to

forego their honest [59] conviction. BY YIELDING THEIR JUDGMENT TO THAT OF A MAJORITY, no matter how large. When a man knows himself that he is honest, he needs care but little as to what the world may think or say concerning him. * * * There will be opposition to the Latter-day Saints until the whole social fabric of the world is revolutionized. In seeing these things we are only witnessing the fulfillment of that which has been prophesied. We may expect to see men who are corrupt arise and proclaim this people are wicked. * * * The best and most honorable men of the community, as a rule HAD ENTERED INTO PLURAL MARRIAGE and were the objects of the cruel persecutions that are now being enforced." --(Deseret News, April 6, 1885).

Many of the Saints are wondering why the change in Elder Grant's position on this important question, since being elevated by the people to the Presidency of the Church. Surely the law of God has not changed. Then why should we now yield to the demands of a majority? Would the three Hebrews mentioned by Brother Grant, or Daniel, or, to bring the case nearer home, Joseph, Brigham, Heber C. Kimball, or John Taylor have yielded to the wicked demands of a nation which God, through his prophet said was "STEEPED IN SIN AND RIPENED FOR THE DAMNATION OF HELL?" (Mill. Star 41:243).

Space will not permit our going further into this phase of the subject now, but surely from the above information and that given in the Jenson-Ballard correspondence, the reader has not failed to see the difference in the two systems of marriage, and to understand why the opposition is so strongly arrayed against the eternity of the marriage covenant as comprehended in the Patriarchal or plural order. And it is strange that one in the position of Elder Ballard, knowing that which he ought to know in order to be a special witness of Jesus Christ in all the world, should hold up the monogamic system--the system that Satan has inspired into existence--as a means of salvation as potent as the Lord's system can be. In making this observation we of course do not overlook Elder Ballard's claim that while both [60] systems of marriage finally lead to the same goal, the plural system, by reason of its insuring speedier procreation, will obviously get its candidate there a little sooner. However, such brainstorm reasoning and mental clairvoyancy will impress the student with the utter emptiness of the Elder's position.

Early Efforts to Destroy System

Let the reader understand then, that from the moment the Lord restored the Patriarchal order of marriage, by revealing it anew to Joseph Smith, Satan accepted the challenge and prepared to fight the law to the bitter end. Knowing that the survival of the system meant his total defeat, he determined upon bringing about a sentiment and an antagonism that would "sink the law out of existence", as Elder Jenson mentions. Naturally this fight began long before the body of Saints at Kirtland knew of the existence of the revelation involved.

We read in Church history of Joseph declaring that "of the Twelve Apostles chosen in Kirtland (in 1835) * * * there have been only two but who have lifted their heel against me--namely

Brigham Young and Heber C. Kimball." (His. of Ch. 5:412).

And again, that Brigham Young was forced to leave Kirtland because of the fury of the mobs who threatened to kill him "because he would proclaim publicly and privately that he knew by the Holy Ghost, that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of the Most High God;" (Church Chronology p. 14) and Heber C. Kimball spoke of a time "when the Church was broken up in Kirtland, and when there were not twenty persons ON THE EARTH that would declare that Joseph Smith was a Prophet of God." (J. of D. 4:105). Satan adopted the tactics of trying to destroy the principle of Patriarchal marriage at its birth. But what [61] weapons did Satan find the most useful in combatting this principle? President Joseph F. Smith once depicted the three dangers that threatened the Church within, as being:

1. Flattery by prominent men of the world.
2. False educational ideas.
3. Sexual impurity

--(Gospel Doctrines, pp. 391-2).

It will be clear to the reader that these three "ace cards" played their part well in bringing about the apostasy spoken of and which resulted in the Saints being finally driven westward.

After the death of the Prophet and the Church had found a resting place in the mountains, an effort was again made to bring about a reformation among the Saints and have them adhere to their religion more faithfully than before. This achievement was thought possible in view of the natural isolation of the Saints from their former enemy--Babylon. Here they would be free from many of the temptations which had beset them in their earlier environs surrounded by nonbelievers.

Brigham Young, as God's medium on earth, offered the Saints a blanket forgiveness of their past sins if they would but turn and serve Jehovah. He told them if they would cease from their wickedness they would never again come under any other rule than that of the Priesthood of Almighty God. Said he again:

"I have had visions and revelations instructing me how to organize this people so they can live like the family of heaven (doubtless the heavenly pattern Elder Jenson refers to in his correspondence), but I cannot do it while so much selfishness and wickedness reign in the Elders of Israel. * * * There are many great and glorious privileges for the people, which they are not prepared to receive. How long it will be before they are prepared to enjoy the blessings God has in store for them, I know not--it has not been revealed to me. --(J. of D. 9:269).

[62] The great leader had said that the Saints were no longer worthy to look upon the face of Joseph Smith, hence the Lord took him unto himself and later, lamenting the disorganized condition of the Church, the Prophet said:

"I sometimes think that I would be willing to give anything * * * to see one fully organized branch of this kingdom one fully organized ward * * * Is there even in this territory (Utah) a fully organized ward? Not one. * * * Because the people are incapable of being organized."--(J. of D. 10:20).

And then, as if guided by a vision of the future he uttered many warnings lest the Saints give way and cease their vigilance. Said he:

"When" (mind you--not IF--but WHEN), "when Mormonism finds favor with the wicked in this land, it will have gone into the shade; but until the power of the Priesthood is gone Mormonism will never become popular with the wicked." --(J. of D. 4:38).

And again:

"When the spirit of persecution, the spirit of hatred, of wrath and malice ceases in the world against this people, it will be the time that this people have apostatised and joined hands with the wicked, and never until then." --Discourses of B. Y. 171-2).

And, "You may calculate, WHEN this people are called to go through scenes of affliction and suffering, are driven from their homes, and cast down, and scattered, and smitten and peeled the Almighty is rolling on his work with greater rapidity." --Ibid. 538)

Brigham Young, like Joseph Smith before him, spoke as "one having authority." Said he on Jan. 2, 1870:

"I know just as well what to teach this people and just what to say to them and what to do in order to bring them into the celestial kingdom, as I know the road to my office. It is just as plain and easy. The Lord is in our midst. He teaches the people continually. I have never yet preached a sermon and SENT IT OUT to the children of men, that they MAY NOT CALL IT SCRIPTURE. * * * In the days of Joseph revelation was given and written, and the people were driven from city to city and [63] place to place, until we were lead into these mountains. LET THIS GO TO THE PEOPLE WITH `THUS SAITH THE LORD' and if they do not obey it, you will see the chastening hand of the Lord upon them." --(Deseret News, January 29, 1870).

This was the keynote of President Young's admonitions, promises and warnings. His life had been dedicated to the building up of the Kingdom and he was moved by an intense desire to have the Saints do right and qualify for Celestial glory. And let us here observe, how different was the warning cry of the early leaders who were in constant communion with the Lord, to the attitude of the present brethren who have acknowledged a total absence of revelation from the Lord to them. To make friends of Babylon, form newspaper and magazine connections and to enter into syndicating agreements; also alliances with the moneyed interests, apparently is the goal of the present leaders, as judged by their actions and public utterances. The Apostle James said:

"Know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world IS THE ENEMY OF GOD." --(James 4:4).

Brigham Young expressed the same principle in another form. Said he:

"Fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters are no more to me than are any other persons, unless they embrace this work. Here (in the congregation before him) are my fathers, my mothers, my sisters and my brethren in the kingdom, and I have none outside of it, neither in any part of the earth, nor in all the eternity of the Gods. In this kingdom are my acquaintances, relatives and friends--my soul, my affections, my all." --(J. of D. 8:199).

It is the boast and the avowed mission of our present leaders to popularize the Church, by fraternizing with the world and establishing friendships with Babylon.

Progress along this line is a topic that frequently engages the attention of the speakers in their public utterances.

[64] Joseph had taught, as Elder Jenson makes clear, that Celestial or Patriarchal marriage, as it had been revealed to him, comprehended as a necessary element thereof, plural marriage. In other words, that to marry Celestially and have "endless increase" one must enter into plural marriage and "abide" in that order. Hyrum taught the same. They proved their faith by their works and, themselves embraced the principle of plural marriage. Brigham Young, John Taylor and many others, as has been shown, were taught the doctrine and embraced it, but it was not at that time made a Church tenet.

The Saints were driven West and in these mountains, in 1852, it formally and officially adopted the order of Patriarchal marriage and urged adherence to it, even requiring those in presiding positions to enter into this order. Said Brigham Young: "Whosoever receives not this law and rejects it is damned." And Church members professing not to believe in this doctrine were denied the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

Law Interpreted by Committee

Elder Jenson refers to a report made by President Ivins, to the effect that about the year 1920, a committee said to be headed by Dr. James E. Talmage, was selected to determine the real meaning of the marriage law of the Church. The necessity for such a determination, doubtless, arose from certain elements in the Church, who were looking for a modernized version, having rejected the interpretation given by the Prophet Joseph Smith. Previous to this (Jan. 15, 1905), the same Dr. Talmage, in giving testimony before the committee on Privileges and Elections, in the Reed Smoot case (See Smoot Hearing Vol. 3 :95, 97) gave as his judgment "that any person who had entered into plural [65] marriage since the Manifesto (September 1890) HAS COMMITTED AN UNCHASTE ACT."

Subsequently in his "Story and Philosophy of Mormonism," the eminent doctor, as quoted elsewhere herein, characterized the principle of plural marriage "an incident" to the gospel, "never an essential."

In the light of the above, is it any wonder that the committee on Interpretation spoken of by President Ivins, of which Dr. Talmage was a member, should take a similar stand? It must be noted, however, that the decision of this committee remained a secret, not having been presented to the Saints for their approval until some thirteen years later, when the First Presidency issued an "Official State meet" (June 17, 1933) in which the finding of the Talmage Committee was given as the position of the Church. This, mind you, was some eighty-nine years after the revelation was received by Joseph Smith and about eighty years after Joseph Smith declared Celestial marriage to mean plural marriage, sealing his testimony with his blood!

But long before this 1920 investigation, a very noted committee sat upon the same question. This was August 28-29,

1852, when a special conference of the Church was held at Salt Lake City, the business of which, in part, was the official introduction of the revelation on plural marriage). (See Mill. Star--Supplement--Vol. 15).

At this conference, and comprising the committee mentioned were the following Priesthood: Brigham Young, Heber C. Kimball and Willard Richards, the First Presidency; Apostles Orson Pratt, John Taylor, Wilford Woodruff, George A. Smith, Ezra T. Benson, Erastus Snow and Franklin D. Richards; and of the First Presidents of Seventies, Joseph Young, Henry Herriman, Zera Pulsipher, Albert P. Rockwood and Jedediah M. Grant, besides other priesthood units and about two thousand Saints. Presi-[66]dent Brigham Young and Apostle Orson Pratt were the spokesmen for the occasion, the proceedings being entirely public and published to the world. Elder Orson Pratt, in introducing the subject, before the reading of the revelation (Sec. 132) stated in part:

"It is well known, however, to the congregation before me that the Latter-day Saints have embraced the doctrine of a plurality of wives as a part of their religious faith." *

"But, says the objector, we cannot see how this doctrine can be embraced as a matter of religion and faith; *

"In reply we will show you that it is incorporated as part of our religion, and NECESSARY FOR OUR EXALTATION to the fulness of the Lord's glory in the eternal world."

Here the speaker proceeds to show clearly that the system used by the Lord in bringing forth spirit bodies and later clothing them with earthly tabernacles, was the order of plural marriage, by which order "eternal increase" was obtained. Continuing, the speaker said:

"Here, then, we perceive, just from this one principle, reasoning from the blessings of Abraham alone, the necessity--if we would partake of the blessings of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob of doing their work, and he that will not do the works of Abraham and walk in his footsteps will be deprived of his blessings."

"Now let us inquire," continued the speaker, "what will become of those individuals who have this law taught unto them in plainness if they reject it? I will tell you. 'They will be damned,' saith the Lord God Almighty in the revelation he has given. Why? Because where much is given much is required; * * * This was the word of the Lord to his servant Joseph, the prophet himself. With all the knowledge and light he had, he must comply with it, or, says the Lord unto him, you shall be damned, and the same is true in regard to all those who reject these things."

In closing, Elder Pratt said: "There will be many who will not hearken, there will be the foolish among the wise who will not receive the new and everlasting covenant. IN FULLNESS, and they NEVER WILL attain to their exaltation, they NEVER WILL be counted worthy to hold the scepter of power over a numerous progeny, that shall multiply themselves without end, like the sand upon the seashore."

[67] Here it will be noted Elder Pratt uses the expression "New and Everlasting Covenant In Fullness," as Joseph F. Smith used

the term at a later date, as shown herein.

Following Elder Pratt, President Brigham Young, among other things stated:

"You heard Brother Pratt state this morning, that a revelation would be read this afternoon which was given previous to Joseph's death. * * * The revelation will be read to you. The principle spoken upon by Brother Pratt this morning we believe in. And I tell you--for I know it--it will sail over and ride triumphantly above all the prejudice and priestcraft of the day; it will be fostered and believed in by the more intelligent portions of the world as one of the best doctrines ever proclaimed to any people. * * *

"The world has known long ago, even in Joseph's days, that he had more wives than one. One of the Senators in Congress knew it very well. Did he oppose it? No. But he has been our friend all the day long, especially upon this subject. He said pointedly to his friends: 'If the United States do not adopt that very method (plural marriage), let them continue as they now are; pursue the precise course they are now pursuing, and it will come to this, that their generations will not live until they are 30 years old.' Said he. 'Joseph has introduced the best plan for restoring and establishing strength and long life among men of any man on earth, and the Mormons are a very good and virtuous people.'

"Many others are of the same mind; they are not ignorant of what we are doing in our social capacity. They have cried out, 'Proclaim it;' but it would not do a few years ago; everything must come in its time, as there is time to all things. I am now ready to proclaim it. * * *

"It is all connected with the exaltation of man, showing how he becomes exalted to be a king and a priest, yea, even a God like his Father in Heaven. Without the doctrine that this revelation reveals (plural marriage--not monogamy) NO MAN ON EARTH EVER COULD BE EXALTED TO BE A GOD."

In the light of the above, fortified by previous and subsequent statements of the authorities, as quoted herein, how can any sane person, and especially a Latter-day Saint, claim plural marriage not to be an essential element of [68] Celestial marriage? No one, we submit, except it be a professional juggler of words and meaning.

However, even in that day, and after the above action, there were in the Church, professing to be Saints, those who were urging monogamy as the ideal marriage system. The spirit of Babylon was working, and the siren call inviting each woman to want a husband to herself, was heard above the teaching of the leader. This spirit was strongly resisted by the brethren and above the din and noise of apostasy the voices of the living prophets were again heard. One of them, Heber C. Kimball, said:

"Many of this people have broken their covenants * * * by finding fault with the plurality of wives and TRYING TO SINK IT OUT OF EXISTENCE. But you cannot do that, for God will cut you off and raise up another people that will carry out his purposes in righteousness unless you walk up to the line in your duty. On the one hand there is glory

and exaltation; and on the other no tongue can express the suffering and affliction this people will pass through, if they do not repent. --(J. of D. 4:108).

Again he said:

"If you oppose what is called the `spiritual wife doctrine,' the Patriarchal Order, which is of God, that course will corrode you with a spirit of apostasy, and you will go overboard; still a great many do so, and strive to justify themselves in it, but they are not justified of God. When you take that course you put a knife to brother Brigham's breast, and to the breasts of his associates; * *

"The principle of plurality of wives never will be done away." * * * (J. of D. 3:125)

And again:

"I have noticed that a man who has but one wife and is inclined to that doctrine, soon begins to wither and dry up * * * For a man of God to be confined to one woman is small business." --(J. of D. 5:22).

Sustaining this position, Apostle George A. Smith gave expression to the following:

[69] "They are a poor, narrow-minded, pinch backed race of men, who chain themselves down to the law of monogamy, and live all their days UNDER THE DOMINION OF ONE WIFE. They ought to be ashamed of such conduct, and the still fouler channel which flows from their practices; and it is not to be wondered at that they should envy those who so much better understand the social relations." --(J. of D. 3:291).

Resuming the teachings of President Kimball. As he neared the end of his mortal battle, this stalwart man of God--courageous and firm--lamenting the fact that there were many among the Latter-day Saints who would not accept the Celestial law as it applied to the order of plural marriage, in his last discourse in mortality (1868), said:

"There are many here today, who, unless they repent, will never see my face again after my eyes are closed in death. * * * I have not one word of reflection to make against you, yet you are living at a poor dying rate." --(J. of D. 12:190).

How sublime was that spirit--how tragic were his words! "Yet you are living at a poor dying rate." Why so? Because they were refusing to embrace in righteousness that part of the gospel--Patriarchal marriage--that alone meant life eternal--"endless increase", with the "blessing of Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers and Exaltations," together with the eternal companionship of Adam, Jesus, Abraham, Joseph and all the faithful Saints from creation's dawn to the end of life. President Kimball had fought a brave fight and had won, but in the conflict he saw many whom he loved, going down to defeat because of the "flattery of men," "false education" and "sexual impurity", causing them to deny the spirit of the Celestial law.

The spirit of anti-Christ was growing. Satan's power was prevailing. He influenced wicked federal legislation against God's system of marriage; he was determined to "sink the system out of existence." The Saints who were faithful heeded not the

adverse laws. They suffered de-[70]privation of both liberty and property, also imprisonment and, in some cases, death. Yet they were enlisted in a righteous cause, and God was with them. However, discontent grew among those of the Saints who were not willing to "try out" for eternal life. By "flattery" and other sinful devices, Satan led them on a fatal detour; they became ambitious for gain and social preferment, and begun to see in monogamy the ideal marriage system, while that of the Patriarchal order became abhorrent to them. They petitioned the leaders for a suspension of the laws of God, finally demanding it of them; they sought statehood with its political powers and advantages, and for which civic boon they were willing to barter off their salvation.

Saints Weakening

In the year 1885, while President John Taylor and many of his associates were in hiding from federal officers because of their adherence to the law of plural marriage, the Deseret News was doing yeoman service in fighting off the spirit of apostasy and calling the Saints to repentance and to arms. On April 23, 1885, among other things, the News said editorially:

Speaking of the efforts of the enemy to crush the Saints: "The chief object of the crusade is to get the Church to apostatize. That arrived at, nothing more would be necessary for the satisfaction of the enemies of the work of God. That accomplished they would be jubilant and hell would rejoice.

"What would be necessary to bring about the result nearest the hearts of the opponents of 'Mormonism', more properly termed the Gospel of the Son of God? SIMPLY TO RENOUNCE ABROGATE OR APOSTATIZE FROM THE NEW AND EVERLASTING COVENANT OF MARRIAGE IN ITS FULLNESS. (Plural marriage). Were the Church to do that as an entirety God would reject the Saints as a body. The authority of the Priesthood would be withdrawn, with its gifts and powers, and there would be no more heavenly recognition of the administrations among the people. The heavens would permanently withdraw themselves, and the Lord would raise up another people of [71] greater valor and stability, for his work MUST, according to his unalterable decrees, GO FORWARD, for the time of the second coming of the Saviour is near even at the doors. Therefore the Saints HAVE NO ALTERNATIVE but to stand by the truth and sustain what the HEAVENS HAVE ESTABLISHED AND PURPOSE TO PERPETUATE. THIS THEY WILL DO, COME LIFE OR DEATH, FREEDOM OR IMPRISONMENT, and there is, so far as we can observe, no use to attempt to disguise this fact.

"As already stated, were the step so much desired on the outside, to be taken, there would probably be but little need of any further opposition, because the Church would be shorn of its strength, HAVING SURRENDERED ITS INTEGRITY because of earthly opposition. Its adherents would no longer be distinctive, but would be like the rest of the world, whose hate would turn to affection (as the leaders today joyfully claim to be the case), because of the love it has for its own. The Saints might have the

meagre satisfaction of having ALL MEN SPEAK WELL OF THEM, but it would be overshadowed by the miserable reflection that they were subject to the woe and misery consequent upon their getting into that lamentable situation."

How well this editorial thought of 1885 describes the situation of the Saints today, after the bulk of them--not all of them thank God, else the Church would be rejected as the editor stated--have surrendered to the enemy and repudiated the order of Celestial marriage and other divine revelations. And "does the world love its own?" The leaders openly proclaim this to be a fact.

Again, on June 5th of the same year, the News said, in part:

"Influences are at work whose object is to create an impress sign in favor of the renunciation or temporary suspension of the law of CELESTIAL MARRIAGE. (And here note that it is "Celestial marriage" spoken of, which the news knew as plural marriage, for there has never been opposition against monogamic marriage, which Apostle Ballard now characterizes as Celestial marriage, if performed in the Temple). Arguments are being used to that end, in a semi-private way, with a view to GAINING CONVERTS TO THAT IDEA.

"Perhaps such pleadings may influence a few people who are not in the habit of probing subjects to the bottom and are not [72] particularly gifted with the power to analyze the motives by which men are actuated. Good Latter day Saints, however, who have within themselves that needful reason for the hope that inspires them are not affected by the SHALLOW PRETEXTS OF SEMI-APOSTATES."

Then, after introducing the claim of some of the Saints, which, by the way, is the precise claim made by the present Church leaders, that the Lord had absolved them from further upholding this order of marriage by the 124th Sec., D. C., the article continues:

"But they should not be so inconsistent as to put forth the FLIMSY CLAIM that their course is sustained by the revelations of the Almighty. They had better acknowledge that their faith in revelation has dwindled to a fine point, IF IT EVER EXISTED IN THEIR BREASTS AT ALL, until it is scarcely discernable. They should at once proclaim themselves AS UNBELIEVERS in the claim that the revelations on Celestial marriage is of divine origin, or else admit that they do not POSSESS THE COURAGE OF THEIR CONVICTIONS.

"But we are not yet through with treating upon the quotations sometimes referred to by the WEAK BACKED WHO NEED A RAMROD FASTENED PARALLEL WITH THEIR SPINAL COLUMN, and occasionally manifest a desire to see the stiffening taken out of others. A favorite passage used by such (and the same passage is used today as a basis for the issuance of the Manifesto and the present Church attitude in repudiating the order of plural marriage), will be found on pages 435 of (the Doctrine and Covenants). Here it is:

`Verily, verily I say unto you, that when I give a commandment to any of the sons of men, to do a work unto my name, and those sons of men go with all their might, and

with all they have to perform that work, and cease not their diligence, and their enemies come upon them, and hinder them from performing that work; behold, it behooveth me to require that work no more at the hands of those sons of men, but to accept of their offering.

And the iniquity and transgression of my holy laws and commandments, I will visit upon the heads of those who hindered my work, unto the third and fourth generation, so long as they repent not, and hate me, saith the Lord God.

`Therefore for this cause have I accepted the offering of those whom I commanded to build up a city and a house unto [73] my name, in Jackson County, Missouri, and were hindered by their enemies, saith the Lord your God.'

"It is a little singular that some people will persistently refuse to see the difference between a certain special work and a principle or law. The consistency of the Lord relieving the people from any such obligation as the building of a house when prevented by enemies from accomplishing it is self evident. When it comes to the abrogation of a law, a principle, a truth, the matter is entirely different. The revelation does not apply even remotely to the present situation."

Manifesto Proposed

This desire for civic peace, against which the above articles and many others were aimed, had taken root in fertile soil and it grew apace, until in September 1886 a manifesto suspending the practice of plural marriage was presented to President John Taylor for his approval and signature. He was still in hiding and under heavy guard. President Taylor, unwilling to surrender of his own volition, on the night of the 26th of September, took the matter up with the Lord, and was given the revelation which Apostle Ballard referred to as being in existence but "unsigned." Furthermore, in keeping with instructions received at that time from the Lord, President Taylor, under the immediate direction of Joseph Smith, who was present, proceeded to strengthen the machinery that would insure keeping the principle of plural marriage alive even after a similar manifesto should be signed as the Lord foresaw would be the case.

(NOTE: At the end of this chapter the Woolley-Bateman statement, giving a detailed account of this meeting, and the text of the revelation referred to, is given).

Notwithstanding this personal visit of Jesus Christ and the instructions he left, the church members, bent upon obtaining statehood for Utah, even before the death of John Taylor, met in a proposed Constitutional Convention and [74] pledged loyalty to the laws and institutions of the country and their willingness to subordinate the principle of plural marriage and the Priesthood authority to the requirements of the government.

Constitutional Convention

In the Deseret News of July 19, 1887, appear quotations from six leading papers throughout the nation regarding proposed statehood for Utah. A convention had assembled and passed a

constitution in Utah for government approval. From the OMAHA WORLD of July 8, 1887, the News quotes:

"The constitutional convention in Utah has concluded its labors, and has drafted a constitution which provides for THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, and declares BIGAMY AND POLYGAMY to be unlawful. The full text of the constitution has not yet been received, but from the reports obtained it would seem that the Mormons have made IMPORTANT CHANGES in the relations between church and state. Reports from Washington indicate that the admission of Utah, which would be a democratic state and balance Dakota which also asks for admission and is a republican state. The constitution will be carefully SCRUTINIZED and unless it clearly separates church and state and proclaims bigamy and polygamy to BE A CRIME, Utah WILL NOT BE ADMITTED * * * So far as can be judged without seeing the NEW CONSTITUTION, the Mormons have so clearly DEFINED THE SUBORDINATE POSITION OF THE PRIESTHOOD, and so emphatically condemned polygamy as to satisfy the PEOPLE OF THE COUNTRY. The only remaining question is as to whether they act in good faith and would not seek to revive the present state of affairs by an amendment after being admitted and freed from Federal control."

And on July 20th of the same year the News published (editorially) an admission that the people of the church have turned down plural marriage and inserted it in the proposed state constitution.

Said the News:

"These people (meaning those who drafted the constitution and those who sent the delegates) are those who have not violated [75] any law of Congress in reference to bigamy and polygamy. They have, moreover, taken the oath prescribed by Congress concerning their future conduct. THEY ARE THE MAJORITY of the voting citizens. They have FORMULATED PROVISIONS in the constitution which FULLY MEET THE DEMANDS that have been made by the PRESS and by the STATESMEN who have rationally discussed the question, and have surrounded their provisions with SAFE GUARDS that preclude all the objections which could be urged as to their PERMANENCE AND PERPETUITY. WHAT MORE COULD THEY DO? Will the New York Post or some of those Eastern editors who take similar ground to that of the Post answer that simple question?"

As to this Constitutional Convention, we read from Whitney's History of Utah, Vol. 3 pp. 584-5 the following, which forms a part of the proposed constitution to be adopted by the new State:

"Section 3 (of Article 1). There shall be no union of church and state; nor shall any church dominate the state.

"Section 12 (of Article 15). Bigamy and polygamy, being considered incompatible with the Republican form of government, each of them is hereby forbidden, and declared a misdemeanor. Any person who shall violate this section shall, on conviction there of, be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000.00, and by imprisonment for a term of not less than six months, nor more than three years, in the discretion of the court. This section shall be construed as

operative WITHOUT THE AID OF LEGISLATION, and the offenses prohibited by this section SHALL NOT BE BARRED BY ANY STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS within three years after the commission of the offense; NOR SHALL THE POWER OF PARDON EXTEND THERETO UNTIL SUCH PARDON SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES."

Quoting further: "It was also provided that the latter section should not BE AMENDED, until the proposed amendment had been submitted to Congress, approved and ratified by that body, and its action PROCLAIMED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES."

This was in June 1887. In the following August an election was held to vote upon the proposed constitution. At this election participated in admittedly exclusively by the Latter-day Saints, the non-Mormons, as explained by [76] Historian Whitney, taking no part in the proceedings, 13, 195 votes were cast approving the constitution with only 502 against it; showing conclusively that the Saints had resolved on surrendering the principle of plural marriage in order try obtain statehood. Apostasy existed as the News stated would be the case if such a surrender were ever made. And to think that the Saints were willing to surrender not only a principle of salvation, leading to "endless lives," but their civic liberties as evidenced by the provision that no amendment could be made in the law except with the approval of Congress and the President of the United States, a requirement never before or since to our knowledge asked of any other territory applying for statehood, and further: that the power of pardon should be taken from the Chief Executive of the new state, and vested in the President of the United States. In other words, the Saints were willing to surrender all for only a part of the natural rights of a sovereign State; thus multiplying the evidences of apostasy, the natural result of trying to sink a principle of salvation out of existence, as has now been done so far as the Church is concerned!

The leaven of apostasy was working. The Church membership was surely drawing away from the Priesthood and placing themselves in a position whereby the keys of the kingdom could not longer continue with them. The children of Israel had, centuries before, rejected the word of the Lord and his divine laws, causing the Lord to take Moses and the keys of the Priesthood from their midst. They were no longer judged worthy the great blessings of the higher order of the Priesthood. Speaking of a like situation, Brigham Young stated:

"Why have they wandered so far from the path of truth and rectitude? Because they left the priesthood and have had no guide, no leader, no means of finding out what is true and what is not true. It is said the Priesthood was taken from the Church, [77] but it is not so, the Church went from the Priesthood, and continued to travel in the wilderness, turned from the commandments of the Lord, and instituted other ordinances." --(J. of D. 12:69).

The above is a perfect picture of the conditions that began to prevail at this time when the Saints were making concessions in order to obtain statehood, and the picture was completed with the signing of the Manifesto. As early as 1853 Apostle Franklin D. Richards saw the "writing on the wall" and stated:

"The Priesthood in the last days is to be manifested in sufficient power to bear off the kingdom of God triumphant that all Israel may be gathered and saved. If all Israel will not be sanctified by the law which their Moses first offers them, they will peradventure receive a LAW OF ORDINANCES ADMINISTERED TO THEM, NOT ACCORDING TO THE POWER OF ENDLESS LIFE. Men will be saved in the last days as in former days, according to their faith and willingness to receive the word of God, and walk in it." --(Mill Star 16:36).

President Taylor died July 25, 1887, and Wilford Woodruff came to the Presidency. The weaklings of Mormonism began hounding him for a cessation of the practice of the principle--men and women--influential in business and social circles, many of them monogamists, but members of the Church. In 1889 President Woodruff recorded in his Journal:

Woodruff Manifesto

"November 24, 1889. Attended a meeting with the lawyers at the Gardo (the home in which President Woodruff resided, known as the Gardo House), in the evening. They wanted me to make some concession to the court upon Polygamy and other points, and I spent several hours alone and inquired of the Lord and received the following revelation:" (For the complete text see Supplement to New and Everlasting Covenant of Marriage, pp. 63-66).

Here the Lord, among other things said:

"Let not my servants who are called to the Presidency of my Church deny my word or my law, which concerns the salva-[78]tion of the children of men. Let them pray for the Holy Spirit which shall be given them to guide them in their acts. Place not yourselves in jeopardy to your enemies by promise. Your enemies seek your destruction and the destruction of my people. * * *

"Let my servants who officiate as your counselors before the courts make their pleadings as they are moved upon by the Holy Spirit, without ANY FURTHER PLEDGES from the Priesthood. * * *

"I cannot deny my word, neither in blessing nor judgments. Therefore let mine anointed gird up their loins, watch and be sober and keep my commandments. * * * "

How similar was this revelation to that received three years previously by President Taylor. Here the Lord said: "I cannot deny my word, neither in blessing nor judgments"; to President Taylor he had said: "I, the Lord do not change, and my word and my covenants and my law do not * * * have not revoked this law, nor will I, etc."

Ten months later, however, President Woodruff yielded to the demands of those wanting plural marriage stopped and signed the manifesto that was prepared by some of the brethren and changed to its present form by a committee of bitter anti-Mormons; and this is the document which Elder Ballard says "stopped the practice of plural marriage," but which Elder Jensen shows did not stop it, and in fact has not stopped it to date.

We have shown in the foregoing how the effort to sink the

law of plural marriage out of existence succeeded, at least so far as the main body of the Church is concerned. The Saints gave way to the allurements of Babylon. Like Lehi who, in vision, was guided to the "tree of life" and found the fruit thereof delicious, but many others who joined him, were made ashamed by those of the world pointing their fingers of scorn, and drifted away into outer darkness and were lost; so the Latter-day Saints were shamed by Babylon into desiring that which the Lord knew would prove their downfall and which did finally rob them of the hope of complete salvation.

[79] Elder Ballard Labors Against Principle

We are advised that Elder Ballard is spending much of his time among Latter day Saint communities, endeavoring to explain away the real meaning of Section 132 (Doctrine and Covenants) the marriage law of God; that he reads down to the 20th verse of the revelation, then closing the book, says: "There, you see, not one word is said about plural marriage." And when he is asked to read further, the request is ignored.

"The new and everlasting covenant of marriage which entitles a person to the highest degree of celestial glory," said Elder Ballard, "is not plural marriage. Plural marriage is wholly unlawful and wholly wrong." --(Celestial Marriage, Broadbent, 3rd Ed. p. 3).

Following the above item the compiler proceeds to analyze the situation thus:

"If there is a law irrevocably decreed in heaven--upon which all blessings are predicated" (D. & C. 130:20), is Patriarchal law and order a part thereof? If not what is? If God cannot revoke an everlasting law, upon which an everlasting blessing is predicated, can man? If man can revoke, abrogate, annul or set aside an everlasting law why not call the President (of the Church), Pope; and the Twelve--Cardinals? Or, better still, all join the Roman Catholic Church and thus avoid expensive duplication? Is the professing Saint who would do anything his Bishop, President or the Leaders tell him, 'even if he knew he was wrong,' thereby trying to shoulder his sins of omission or commission on another man's priesthood, any better than the Catholic with his infallibility doctrine? As a matter of fact isn't the doctrine of infallibility the only recourse for professing Saints who oppose the principle or practice of plural marriage? Doesn't man in his attempt to set aside law and revelation set himself up 'above all that is called God?' Perhaps 'wholly unlawful and wholly wrong,' so far as man made laws are concerned, but if God's laws aren't to be observed rather than man's wasn't Nephi, in slaying the king and taking the plates, a murderer and a thief?" (See D. & C. 98:23-32).

Joseph Smith said: "If any man preach any other gospel than that which I have preached, HE SHALL BE [80] CURSED." (H. of C 6:365). Elder Ballard is doing this very thing. He is doing his utmost to sink the law of God out of existence as Elder Jenson charges, and in doing this he is "preaching another gospel," he is betraying the revelations of the Lord. Joseph further said:

"O ye Twelve!--(Mark it well Elder Ballard)--Ye

Twelve! AND ALL SAINTS! profit by this important key--that in all your trials, troubles, temptations, afflictions, bonds, imprisonments and death, see to it, that you do not betray heaven; that you do not betray Jesus Christ, that you do not betray the brethren, that you do not betray the REVELATIONS OF GOD; whether in the Bible, Book of Mormon or Doctrine and Covenants, or any other that ever was or will be given and revealed unto man in this world or that which is to come. Yea, in all your kickings and flounderings, see to it that you do not this thing, lest innocent blood be found upon your skirts, and you go down to hell!" --(His. of Ch. 3:385).

We hold that to reject a revelation of the Lord, change its meaning, or to sink it out of existence, and to assist in persecuting the Saints who are living in accordance with the laws of God, is a betrayal of heaven, of Jesus Christ, of the brethren and of the revelations of God.

But resuming, can any one with average intelligence, read the lame and flimsy claims--contradictory and confusing--contained in Elder Ballard's correspondence, without sensing the shallowness of the man, and the error of his position? What a labored effort he has made to separate plural marriage from the eternity of the marriage covenant. He says:

"So from the very beginning, the leaders of the Church have recognized that the eternity of the marriage covenant stood apart by itself, independent of plural marriage", and the eloquent orator would have the Saints believe such a falsehood! The very opposite is true, as has been shown herein, and yet he would have us believe that Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, John Taylor, Heber C. Kimball, Wilford [81] Woodruff, Lorenzo Snow, Joseph F. Smith, and others, as have been quoted, did not know what they were talking about when they proclaimed in clearness and boldness that Celestial marriage was plural marriage, and the only order of marriage by which one could hope to regain the presence of God in Celestial glory, "the only marriage that is popular in heaven," as Brigham Young said. This man of letters would have us believe himself to be a greater exponent of eternal laws than God's Prophet who stands at the head of this dispensation and who gave his blood to seal his testimony. Discussing this question of the early prophets not knowing the real meaning of the law of Celestial marriage, leaving it to the present leaders to make it clear, one of the brethren sagely remarked: "Well I've always noticed that water is purer at the fountain source in the mountains, than it is after flowing down into the valley through weed patches, cow corrals and dung piles." Comment here is unnecessary.

Speaking of the peculiar twisting and squirmings going on at Washington in the early days in the attempt of the law makers to pass unconstitutional laws against the Mormons, without having the appearance of being unconstitutional, Brigham Young aptly said--and his words apply most admirably to Elder Ballard's exhibition of twisting, etc. Said he:

"They (the Washington Administration) make me think of a sign in New York, upon which was lettered 'ALL MANNER OF TWISTING AND TURNING DONE HERE.' It is just so in Washington City, they can twist and turn in any and every way, to suit their hellish appetites." --(J. of D. 5:235).

Plural Marriage Surrendered for Political Freedom

Brigham Young had foreseen the willingness of the Saints to subordinate plural marriage to the cause of political freedom, and sounded a warning thus:

[82] "The Lord gave a revelation through Joseph Smith, his servant; and we have believed and practiced it. (Not monogamy, but plural marriage). Now, then, it is said that this must be done away before we are permitted to receive our place as a State in the Union. * * * Do you think that we shall ever be admitted as a State into the Union without DENYING THE PRINCIPLE OF POLYGAMY? IF WE ARE NOT ADMITTED UNTIL THEN WE SHALL NEVER BE ADMITTED." --(J. of D. 11:269).

Here it is shown clearly by prophetic vision, that to obtain political rights to which the Saints were entitled, they must surrender a principle of salvation--a law of the Holy Priesthood. (And that principle was not monogamy which Elder Ballard claims to be Celestial marriage). Did they do so: Let the Church leaders answer.

In the year 1891, shortly after the signing of the Manifesto, the First Presidency and Apostles signed a petition to the President of the United States, praying for amnesty, in which they made this statement:

"To be at peace with the government and in harmony with their fellow citizens who are not of their faith (Babylon), and to share in the confidence of the Government (which Wilford Woodruff had previously stated was 'Steeped in sin and ripened for the damnation of hell') and the people, our people HAVE VOLUNTARILY PUT ASIDE SOMETHING (plural marriage, the law of the Priesthood), WHICH ALL THEIR LIVES THEY HAVE BELIEVED TO BE A SACRED PRINCIPLE." --(Contributor 13:197).

Brigham Young had said:

"When we see the time that we can willingly strike hands and have full fellowship with those who despise the Kingdom of God, know ye then that the Priesthood of the Son of God is out of your possession." --(J. of D. 10:273).

And again he said:

"There is nothing that would so soon weaken my hope and discourage me as to see this people in full fellowship with the world, and receive no more persecution from them because they are one with them. (A condition which the present leaders boast of as having been accomplished). In such an event, we might bid farewell to the Holy Priesthood WITH ALL ITS BLESSINGS, PRIVILEGES AND AIDS TO EXALTATIONS, PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS IN THE ETERNITIES OF THE GODS." --(J. of D. 10:32).

And the record shows this very thing has been done, and the leaders boast of it as a glorious triumph, when they and their flock should be humbling themselves in sack cloth and ashes, and praying night and day for the return of the confidence of heaven.

Plural Marriage Necessary

"Concerning the Patriarchal order of marriage, President (John) Taylor said: 'If we do not embrace that principle soon, the keys will be turned against us. If we do not keep the same law that our Heavenly Father has kept, we cannot go with him. A man obeying a lower law (monogamy) is not qualified to preside over those who keep a higher law.' --Life of Wilford Woodruff p. 542).

In harmony with these remarks of President Taylor, Elder Wilford Woodruff observed:

'The reason why the Church and Kingdom of God cannot advance without the Patriarchal order of marriage, is that it belongs to this dispensation, just as baptism for the dead does, or any law or ordinance that belongs to a dispensation. Without it the Church cannot progress. The leading men of Israel who are presiding over Stakes will have to obey the law of Abraham, or they will have to resign. * * *' --(Ibid p. 542).

If then, the order of plural marriage had to be obeyed "or the keys would be turned against the Church;" if the Church could not advance any further without adherence of its members to this holy principle, and if the "leading men of Israel who were presiding over Stakes," were forced to obey the law in order to "qualify them to preside over those who kept a higher law," or else resign, how in the name of reason can Elder Ballard contend that the law is a non-essential, and that monogamy, the principle he is living, will exalt a man in Celestial glory and provide him with "endless increase?" Surely he will not ascribe the [84] language of Presidents Taylor and Woodruff above quoted to over "zeal", "enthusiasm" or "times of stress!"

Elder Ballard sets forth the amazing situation, that while plural marriage is not a necessary part of Celestial marriage, nor a requisite to exaltation, yet there are blessings associated with the practice which monogamists cannot attain to. To be specific:

"That naturally if by plural marriage, as stated, there is provided an opportunity to grow faster toward establishment of the kingdom, AND I AM SURE THAT IS THE ADVANTAGE, then the man who has a wife die and has another sealed to him has two wives for the world to come, and he does have that advantage over the one who has but one wife!

And as there is no "marriage nor giving in marriage in heaven," the status must remain eternally so! What profound reasoning! What a modern Socrates we have in our midst! Pity he was not born earlier to give the Church its bearings at its inception! Let us suppose a case.

John and Henry are good neighbors, fast friends and devoted Latter-day Saints, equally sound in faith and willing to sacrifice all for salvation.

John marries a wife for time and eternity under the authority of the Priesthood; Henry does the same. After bearing him ten sons, John's wife dies; John marries a second wife for time and eternity, who also bears him many children. This gives John two wives and a large family of children. Henry's wife, though faithful and good, is barren, but she does not die; in fact, as if to complete the tragedy, she outlives Henry. The

Church would not let Henry marry in polygamy, though he was willing to sacrifice even to his life to obtain the advantage which came to John through the death of his first wife. But no, John is the fortunate one--his wife died, thus permitting him to enter the plural marriage relation; and Henry's wife--stubborn soul--refused to die, thereby holding Henry back. [85] Though Henry's wife may bear him children in eternity, John has such a lead that Henry cannot be expected to catch up with him during the eternities, and they are never again equal. John, through the death of his wife was permitted to live the law of Abraham and thereby go where Abraham is, while Henry, through his wife not dying, is forever deprived of the privilege. Realizing the seriousness of the situation, one wonders at the great inequality of the law, and if Henry might not be justified in inviting his wife to die so as to enable him to marry another wife and catch up with John!

The great apostle of logic, with the versatility of a "Billy Sunday," professes to believe in the principle enunciated in the revelation of 1886. Says he:

"But still there is nothing in the revelation that the Church disputes, because the correctness of the principle is set forth with emphasis, and the Church has never disputed the truthfulness of the 132nd Section (of Doctrine and Covenants) when the right to practice that principle (plural marriage, which he, Elder Ballard here admits to be the subject of the 132nd Section), has been SANCTIONED BY THE LORD AND THE CHURCH."

Here the sage of interpretation binds God so he can act only in concert with the Church; the latter holding the power of veto. "Me an' Gott", was said to be a favorite expression with Kaiser Wilhelm. To be asked to worship a God whose laws, to make them legal, must be reviewed and endorsed by the Church, does not conduce to a living, vital and lasting faith in what was presumed to be the Infinite.

Elder Ballard admits that the "law of Abraham" has reference to the principle of plural marriage. He also admits the correctness of the principle set forth in the 1886 revelation to John Taylor wherein it stated: "All those who would enter into my glory MUST and SHALL obey my law, and have I not commanded men that if they were [86] Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory they MUST DO THE WORKS OF ABRAHAM." As the "works of Abraham" was the entering into and abiding the order of plural marriage, and Elder Ballard admits this to be the case, then why contend that Satan's system of marriage--monogamy--will get the candidate for Celestial glory to his goal as effectively (even though it may take a little longer), as will plural marriage, which is the Lord's system--the pattern of heaven? And while the Church endorses the revelation in principle, according to Elder Ballard's state meet, why is it doing all it possibly can to nullify God's order of marriage and sink it out of existence as instanced in the "Official Statement" of June 17, 1933, quoted above? It might not be out of place to suggest to the authorities that they get together, adopt one story and cling to it. A censorship might well be established over the correspondence of the brethren, the same as apparently exists with respect to their public speeches made during conference times.

This great man of words rises to the sublime heights of his brand of logic and learning as he pathetically shows how the Lord, wishing to suspend the operations of the principle of plural marriage, was forced to take the life of John Taylor and raise up Wilford Woodruff to sign the document which the Prophet Isaiah had referred to as "an agreement with death and hell!" He presumes to sit in judgment on the "Lion of Israel" who in all his life had not hesitated once to carry out the Lord's command, and characterize him a faithless servant who could not be trusted longer to do the Lord's bidding. In making the statement referred to, the Elder revealed his infinitesimal littleness. Compared with the giant John Taylor, he reminds one of the incident related in early pioneer history: Col. Tom Thumb, three feet six inches tall, traveling with the "midgets" in the "early days," was honored with an interview with President Brigham Young. The Colonel was [87] impressed with much that he saw and heard about the religion of the Saints, and so expressed himself; "but," said he, "President Young, I just can't understand this principle of polygamy you folks are living." Don't let that little thing disturb you, Colonel," responded the Prophet, "for when I was your size I couldn't understand it either."

The intellectual gymnast has no opinion on the question as to whether or not the principle of plural marriage will again be restored to the Saints. Said he: "The Church has not spoken." The Church did say, however, in its "Official Statement" of June 17, 1933: "It became obvious that no human power could prevent the disintegration of the Church, except upon a pledge by its members to obey the laws which had been enacted prohibiting the practice of polygamy." And since the Church, under its present leadership, evidently relies upon "HUMAN POWER" in preference to the power of God for protection and guidance, there is little encouragement to be had in hoping for a restoration of this divine law, except "DIVINE POWER" shall be interposed in the place of "HUMAN POWER." It is a saving principle, an exalting principle and the only principle that will lead one into the presence of Abraham--that being the law of Abraham--and yet Elder Ballard will not venture a guess as to whether God will permit it to be lived again! What caution! What consistency! Could one wish for a better reason for the action of President John Taylor in safeguarding his principle? The absolute necessity of such an act is apparent.

"The Church has not taken the position that Jesus Christ had plural wives," says Elder Ballard, and consequently he will not venture an opinion on the subject. President Jedediah M. Grant and Apostles Orson Hyde and Orson Pratt were courageous enough to testify that Jesus Christ lived this divine law. Elder Ballard admits that it is the "law of Abraham," and consequently a law of God, [88] which must be lived in order to go where God is. President Joseph F. Smith stated:

"Jesus Christ never omitted the fulfillment of a single law that God has made known for the salvation of the children of men. It would not have done for him to have come and obeyed one law and neglected or rejected another. (As Apostle Ballard is doing). HE COULD NOT CONSISTENTLY DO THAT AND THEN SAY TO MANKIND, 'FOLLOW ME.'" --(Mill. Star 62:97).

For, as President John Taylor stated:
"If we do not keep the same law that our Heavenly
Father has kept, we cannot go with him."

And who will have the audacity to say that God failed to
keep his own law!

Yes, Elder Ballard, hereafter, you may safely say that
Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world, embraced the law of
plural marriage; that he qualified, as Joseph Smith and others
did, for "endless increase," and that his seed is with us today
as Isaiah intimated would be the case. (Is. 53:10).

Saints Threatened

In closing let us notice briefly Elder Ballard's warning
and implied threat, in which he follows in the line of previous
statements made by his superiors. For instance President Anthony
W. Ivins said:

"I know of no people who have been made happy, who
have been made prosperous, and whose lives have been made
more enjoyable because of entering into or advocacy of this
principle. I expect the time to come WHEN THE CIVIL LAW
WILL ENTER INTO THIS QUESTION, making the lives of these
people MORE MISERABLE than they already are, for that
appears to be the only manner in which the system (God's
sacred law by which 'endless increase' is realized) CAN BE
STAYED."

President Heber J. Grant announced that:

"None could point to any one who had entered this
principle since its official prohibition. (This official
prohibition Apostle [89] Ballard places at the signing of
the Manifesto in 1890), WHO WAS A PRIDE TO ANY COMMUNITY,
and that the same could be said of their children."

And on another occasion, he wrote:

"I shall REJOICE when the government officials put a
few of these * * * (polygamists) in the County jail or the
State penitentiary."

Repeating in substance these childish and unchristian like
expressions, Elder Ballard concludes his correspondence with:

"I trust this may be helpful to you and assure you
that my anxious desire is that those who are blinded by the
arguments of men shall have their eyes opened to see the
SORROW and DISTRESS that is coming to those who are living
now in wilful violation of the rules of the Church, which
is only a FORE SHADOWING OF SORROW AND TROUBLE that shall
come to every man and woman who violates the rules and
regulations of the Church and disobeys the counsel of
Heaven."

Here the man of eloquence again links the Church up with
God or Heaven; and we agree with him that disobedience to the
"counsel or heaven", can only meet with dire results; but when
he prates of disobedience to "church rules" he takes in a wide
territory. Joseph F. Smith testified in the Smoot case before
the Committee on Privileges and Elections (see Smoot Case Vol.
1:335-6), that he was living in open violation of the "rules of
the Church;" so did Francis M. Lyman; so did B. H. Roberts and
several others of the presiding brethren, and no one has
attempted to deny salvation to them. President Smith was

arrested, pleaded guilty and fined for disobeying the laws of the land, by living in the polygamous relation, and consequently violating the "rules of the Church," and all "red blooded" Latter day Saints approved the course which he took. Why? Because he was obeying God rather than man. And yet this great expounder (?) of righteousness hurls the threat of SORROW, DISTRESS and TROUBLE at [90] those who, in meekness and in sublime faith and patience, are living the same celestial law the best they know how. Look to your own knitting, Elder Ballard. Do you not know that the church which you are helping to popularize with Babylon has, for more than forty years, been wandering in the wilderness, and that as a result of attempting to suspend an eternal law?

Fruits of Surrendering God's Law

Some of the direct fruits of denying the sanctity of plural marriage are apostasy and whoredom. The Prophet John Taylor, at the time of receiving the 1886 revelation, predicted that if the practice of plural marriage was suspended, as he saw would be attempted, "apostasy and whoredom would be rampant in the Church." Without any hesitancy or reservation, but with deepest regrets and with sorrowing hearts, we now claim the literal fulfillment of this prediction. To do away with that principle of salvation upon which the social stability and purity of the Saints was founded and maintained for more than half a century, and which is heaven's great social law, meant the introduction of the opposite. Hence, in natural sequence, following the issuance of the Manifesto, the heavens were closed to the Church and revelations through its leaders ceased; then came the changing of the ordinances of the Temple, culminating in the mutilation and repudiation of the garment of the Holy Priesthood and finally, in failing to confer the Priesthood, by giving only the appendage office.

What spirit prompted the Saints to demand a change in the garment? President Joseph F. Smith, foreseeing the situation sounded the following warning:

"The Lord has given us garments of the Holy Priesthood, and you know what that means. And yet there are those of us who mutilate them, in order that we may follow the foolish, vain and (permit me to say) indecent practices of the world. In order [91] that such people will imitate the fashions they will not hesitate to mutilate that which should be held by them the most sacred of all things in the world, next to their own virtue, next to their own purity of life. They should hold these things that God has given unto them sacred, UNCHANGED AND UNALTERED from the very pattern which God gave them. Let us have the moral courage to stand against the opinions of fashion, and especially where fashion compels us to break a covenant and so commit a grievous sin." --(Improvement Era 9:813-14).

Evidently the present Church leaders, including Elder Ballard, did not possess the "moral courage to stand against the opinions of fashion," for they entered a decree, and published it, that the garment to be worn outside of the Temple, may be mutilated and abbreviated to fit in with the "fashion" of Babylon.

The Manifesto was adopted, as has been shown, that the Saints might "be at peace with the Government and in harmony with their fellow citizens who were not of their faith (Babylon)." Similarly that garment of the Holy Priesthood was altered, and its real significance destroyed especially that the sisters might feel free in their social minglings with the world, where the amenities of the occasion often renders it necessary to expose their bodies to the gaze of lecherous men. This very situation has led to whoredom, the crowning sin of the age. The holy garment was given, among other things, as a protection against sexual temptation and sin, and to throw off that divine armor, as is now very generally being done, by either not wearing them at all or adopting a flimsy make believe which is not a garment as the Lord intended, of necessity has robbed the Saints of that rare distinction which once characterized them an essentially pure and "peculiar" race.

Now what have we? Mormon girls in their "teens" recruited to supply the ever increasing requirements of "houses of ill fame", which are patronized liberally by Mormon boys; alcoholic and "dope" addicts; suicides; young [92] Mormon wives prostituting their bodies by following modern "birth control" methods, paying for their vain folly in the Babylonish coins of broken health and loss of natural beauty and charm; the daughters of Zion, once renowned for their modesty, comeliness and virtue, now attending the public ball rooms in modern dress and, with whisky defiled breaths, parading their half nude bodies with vulgar hilarity before strangers with whom they often form friendly contacts, and, as Isaiah pictured: "Walking with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go; "also graphically described by the Poet Noyes:

"The cymbals clash, and the dancers walk--

Long silk stockings and arms of chalk;

Butterfly skirts and white breasts bare--

And the eyes of dead men watching them there."

Do you or the leaders of the Church deny these strictures?

They are true, and the proof of them is within the purview of your own knowledge, if you will but cease your calumny against the true Saints long enough to examine into the lives of the rank and file of the flock which you presume to preside over.

Elder Ballard, the "DISTRESS" and "TROUBLE" you are wishing on others are rapidly overtaking the families of the leaders and Saints who are repudiating God's sacred laws. "Tragedy" is being written on every threshold, the evidence of which is found in the ineffaceable records of the mental and public hospitals, prisons, public brothels, saloons, gambling dens and cemeteries. Men of the Priesthood who would destroy principles of life and salvation, as you are doing, must pay for their folly in their own lives and often the lives of their offspring, for it has been decreed that "the sins of the parents shall be visited upon their children" often, to the third and fourth generation. In sorrow we write this. We would that all men might re-[93]pent and come to an understanding of God's laws, walking in the straight and narrow way of life.

And so, in consequence of the Church repudiating a principle of salvation, and persecuting those of its members who insist on living the full gospel as revealed, the heavens have been closed against it and darkness reigns. Now, that the light

of heaven is needed as never before to guide the floundering and perishing Saints to a safe mooring; when the distress of nations cries out for prophetic direction to rescue them from the threatened and impending dis-solution, the mouths of the pretended prophets of Israel are closed and the heavens are as brass over them. The Prophet Micah saw the situation. Proclaimed he:

"Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people err (by teaching them false traditions), that bite with their teeth (crying to cut people off for doing right), and cry, peace; and he that putteth not into their mouths (the word of God); they even prefer war against him (by pledging their support in persecuting the Saints).

"Therefore night shall be unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine, and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them.

"THEN SHALL THE SEERS BE ASHAMED, AND THE DIVINERS CONFOUNDED; YEA THEY SHALL ALL COVER THEIR LIPS; FOR THERE IS NO ANSWER OF GOD." --(Micah 3:5-7).

Do you deny this charge as applying to the present situation? If you do, point to one revelation received from the Lord by the present leaders. The President himself has disclaimed having had any. In a recent effort to prove the worthiness and the sincerity of the present leader, one of his apostolic associates recently said: "He is a good man, he so frequently says, 'O, if we could only get the word of the Lord on the subject.'" Think of it, the mouthpiece (?) of God denied audience with his Master, while the flock wanders in the wilderness and perish! And yet it is true, as one of the leaders recently stated in a public address; said he: "We have prophets that have ceased to prophesy, seers that cannot see and revelators that do not reveal."

The Saints are in poverty and distress; their homes and farms are heavily mortgaged, many of them being foreclosed, while their owners often lack food and clothing; and instead of being cared for by the Church, they are dumped off onto the public relief institutions where they are often embarrassed and are made to suffer indignities of a shocking nature! And this while the leaders of Ephraim, yourself included, live in ease and comfort, surrounded by the luxuries of life, from large salaries obtained both from the Church and commercial institutions. These, the Lord's poor, are crying for a leadership which is denied them, and they are gradually learning the lesson taught by the late President Joseph F. Smith in the Salt Lake Temple, some twenty five years ago. Said he:

"The time is here when the Saints cannot come to Joseph F. Smith, Francis M. Lyman or Charles W. Penrose, or others, for counsel, but they MUST GO TO THE LORD AND NOT DEPEND UPON THE ARM OF FLESH for guidance."

We spoke of the Priesthood, in this day not being properly conferred on the brethren. This condition was also foreseen by the early leaders. Said President John Taylor at the time of receiving the 1886 revelation:

"I would be surprised if ten percent of those who claim to hold the Melchisedek Priesthood will remain true and faithful to the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the

time of the seventh president, and that there would be thousands that think they held the Priesthood at that time, who would not have it properly conferred upon them."

"The day will come," said President George Q. Cannon, at a meeting in Draper, shortly before his death, "when men's Priesthood and authority will be called into question, and you will find out that there will be hundreds who have no Priesthood, but who believe they hold it, they holding only an office in the Church."

[95] And while these conditions prevail--when the Saints with their leaders should be pleading with the Lord in sackcloth and ashes for forgiveness and guidance, you, Elder Ballard, are flitting about from community to community, trying to explain away a revelation of the Lord, and establish among the Saints monogamous principles which came into being under the direction of Lucifer. The flock is starving for bread and it receives a stone! And yet you turn your batteries of hate upon a small group of Saints who are trying to live God's holy law and, Christ like, help one another; threatening them with the curses of heaven if they do not desist! Fie on such hypocrisy! It has been a favorite past time of yourself and your kind to charge these modern polygamists with adulterous living, dubbing them as "lecherous" and unclean; their children you bastardize and characterize as a "disgrace to the community." With hypocritical piety you, figuratively, pass by on the opposite side of the street, wrapping your priestly (?) robes close about you lest you be contaminated. You deny these men and women the sacramental solace and even object to their attending religious services in church edifices which they have assisted in erecting and maintaining. And now you, aping your file leaders, presume to threaten them with "SORROW, DISTRESS and TROUBLE!"

Elder Ballard, in characterizing this group of Saints as impure and unworthy, you are but multiplying upon yourself and those of your associates who are in harmony with you, the displeasure of heaven. These people whom you are attacking and castigating as unclean are of the Royal Priesthood; they are among the purest and choicest of God's children; they are assuming burdens that you, in your selfish monogamous life, are incapable of understanding, and they experience a joy in so doing that you cannot know and never will experience in your present manner of living. [96] In their poverty and distress these Saints are observing God's first great commandment to "multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it"; they shun modern "birth control" as a foul practice; their children always welcome, are for the most part, bright eyed, clear brained, well formed and of the Royal lineage; their mothers whom you characterize as "silly women, evilly lead," though often denied the necessities and comforts of life, bring forth their precious offspring, Mary like, as in lowly mangers of dingy hovels, rejoicing in the divine favor of motherhood. Such women are the peer of their sex; their faith, actions and ideals might well be copied by your monogamist daughters and wives. These brave women, though often carrying on their bodies the deeply furrowed marks of toil and privation, conspicuous in the plainness and poverty of their gowns, and who, through circumstances largely brought about by their selfish monogamous kindred and neighbors, must often prepare their scanty meals without proper seasoning

and embellishments, yet in comeliness of feature, beauty of life, modesty of action, wholesomeness of spirit, breadth of patience, purity of purpose and richness of companionship they excel. Their garments are unmutilated and unspotted from the sins of this generation. THEY ARE THE MOTHERS OF THE FUTURE PILLARS OF THE KINGDOM! Deny these facts if you choose and continue your unholy tirade against this chosen people at your peril!

You selfish monogamist, living for the day and the comforts thereof; carried away by the melody of your own voice, deigning to counsel men and women deeply scarred by the labors and conflicts of the day--men whose armor is of truth, and whose swords will not be sheathed until the forces of righteousness triumph! They are "carrying on" under the order established by the Lord by the hand of his [97] servant, John Taylor. And, let us ask, where would the Church be today were it not for this faithful band of Priesthood that is sacrificing all to keep an eternal principle alive? You refuse to live the higher law, presuming to counsel those who have grown old in years and experience while fighting for and living that same law! You are destroying the faith of the Saints, adroitly talking away the real meaning of the law of marriage; you are assisting the Prince of darkness in carrying on the nefarious work of the late Dr. Talmage, to "sink the law of plural marriage out of existence," thereby destroying the Priesthood of God from earth; for this very thing you are doing, either knowingly or blindly; and if blindly, you alone are to blame.

The Lord said: "It is not meet that men who will not abide my law shall preside over my Priesthood." (Revelation of 1882). You acknowledge in a dozen ways that this law of God means the order of plural marriage, and yet you, after refusing to live it, and after spending your greatest store of eloquence and reasoning toward "sinking it out of existence," unblushingly assume to counsel those whose lives have been dedicated to the upholding and the perpetuation of that law! But these faithful Saints whom you are maligning are not in the least disturbed by your blustering threats. Paraphrasing the words of the boy King David, they say:

"You come to us armed with the sword of pretended authority, with the spear of prejudice and the shield of popularity, while we meet your thrusts in the name of the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom you and your kind have defied and we smite you this day, unless you repent, for destruction surely awaits you!"

Elder Ballard, the publishers hereof join in the testimony of the Prophet Joseph Smith and his stalwart associates and successors in proclaiming:

[98] That Celestial marriage in its fulness necessitates a plurality of wives.

That the living of the law of plural marriage is a necessary requirement to gain eternal lives--to become "what God is."

That this principle is a law of the Priesthood and functions independent of the Church, (speaking of the Church in the restricted sense.) That it has been revealed to earth for the last time.

That it has not been taken away nor suspended by the Lord.

That the Lord has made ample provision for its perpetuation.

That men and women, guided by the Spirit of the Lord, and with sublime faith and unfaltering courage are entering into and abiding the law in this day.

And finally, that you, if you will repent of your sins, make amends for the havoc you have caused to the faith of the Saints, and call upon the Lord in humility, may enjoy the same testimony.

But if you will not repent and turn to the law of God, let us answer your threat of SORROW, DISTRESS and TROUBLE by the words of Jesus Christ:

"Wo unto that nation, or house or people (or person) who seek to hinder my people from obeying the Patriarchal law of Abraham, which leadeth to a Celestial glory, which has been revealed unto my Saints through the mouth of my servant Joseph, for whosoever doeth these things shall be damned, saith the Lord of Hosts, and shall be BROKEN UP AND WASTED AWAY from under heaven by the judgments which I HAVE SENT FORTH AND WHICH SHALL NOT RETURN TO ME VOID." --(Rev. to Wilford Woodruff of 1880).

[99] "On the one hand," said Heber C. Kimball, speaking of adherence to the law of plural marriage as revealed, "is glory and exaltation; and on the other (to forget this law or sink it out of existence) no tongue can express the suffering and affliction this people will pass through, if they do not repent."

The God of heaven has spoken. You may take your choice.

STATEMENTS OF LORIN C. WOOLLEY AND
DANIEL R. BATEMAN

Given at Salt Lake City, Utah, September 22, 1929. With reference to the Revelation of September 27, 1886, on the subject of Celestial or Plural Marriage, which Revelation was given by the Lord to President John Taylor.

Present: Lorin C. Woolley, Daniel R. Bateman, John Y. Barlow, J. Leslie Broadbent and J. W. Musser. Prayer was offered by John Y. Barlow.

Lorin C. Woolley related the following:

While the brethren were at the Carlisle residence in May or June of 1886, letters began to come to President John Taylor from such men as John Sharp, Horace Eldredge, William Jennings, John T. Caine, Abraham Hatch, President Cluff and many other leading men from all over the Church, asking the leaders to do something, as the Gentiles were talking of confiscating their property in connection with the property of the Church.

These letters not only came from those who were living in the Plural Marriage relation, but also from prominent men who were presiding in various offices of the Church who were not living in that relation. They all urged that [100] something be done to satisfy the Gentiles so that their property would not be confiscated.

George Q. Cannon on his own initiative selected a committee comprising himself, Hyrum B. Clawson, Franklin S. Richards, John T. Caine and James Jack to get up a statement or Manifesto that

would meet the objections urged by the brethren above named. They met from time to time to discuss the situation. From the White home, where President Taylor and companions stopped, after leaving the Carlisle home, they came out to father's. George Q. Cannon would go and consult with the brethren of the committee, I taking him back and forth each day.

On September 26, 1886, George Q. Cannon, Hyrum B. Clawson, Franklin S. Richards, and others, met with President John Taylor at my father's residence at Centerville, Davis County, Utah, and presented a document for President Taylor's consideration.

I had just got back from a three days' trip, during most of which time I had been in the saddle, and being greatly fatigued, I had retired to rest.

Between one and two o'clock P. M., Brother Bateman came and woke me up and asked me to be at my father's home where a Manifesto was to be discussed. I went there and found there were congregated Samuel Bateman, Charles H. Wilkins, L. John Nuttall, Charles Birrell, George Q. Cannon, Franklin S. Richards and Hyrum B. Clawson.

We discussed the proposed Manifesto at length, but we were unable to become united in the discussion. Finally George Q. Cannon suggested that President Taylor take the matter up with the Lord and decide the same the next day.

Brothers Clawson and Richards, were taken back to Salt Lake. That evening I was called to act as guard during the first part of the night, notwithstanding the fact that I was greatly fatigued on account of the three days' trip I had just completed.

[101] The brethren retired to bed soon after nine o'clock. The sleeping rooms were inspected by the guard as was the custom. President Taylor's room had no outside door. The windows were heavily screened.

Sometime after the brethren retired and while I was reading the Doctrine and Covenants, I was suddenly attracted to a light appearing under the door leading to President Taylor's room, and was at once startled to hear the voices of men talking there. There were three distinct voices. I was bewildered because it was my duty to keep people out of that room and evidently someone had entered without my knowing it. I made a hasty examination and found the door leading to the room bolted as usual. I then examined the outside of the house and found all the window screens intact. While examining the last window, and feeling greatly agitated, a voice spoke to me, saying, "Can't you feel the Spirit? Why should you worry?"

At this I returned to my post and continued to hear the voices in the room. They were so audible that although I did not see the parties I could place their positions in the room from the sound of the voices. The three voices continued until about midnight, when one of them left, and the other two continued. One of them I recognized as President John Taylor's voice. I called Charles Birrell and we both sat up until eight o'clock the next morning.

When President Taylor came out of his room about eight o'clock of the morning of September 27, 1886, we could scarcely look at him on account of the brightness of his personage.

He stated, "Brethren, I have had a very pleasant conversation all night with Brother Joseph." (Joseph Smith) I

said, "Boss, who is the man that was there until midnight?" He asked, "What do you know about it, Lorin?" I told him all about my experience. He said, "Brother Lorin, that was your Lord." [102] We had no breakfast, but assembled ourselves in a meeting. I forget who opened the meeting. I was called to offer the benediction. I think my father, John W. Woolley, offered the opening prayer. There were present, at this meeting, in addition to President Taylor, George Q. Cannon, L. John Nuttall, John W. Woolley, Samuel Bateman, Charles H. Wilkins, Charles Birrell, Daniel R. Bateman, Bishop Samuel Sedden, George Earl, my mother, Julia E. Woolley, my sister, Amy Woolley, and myself. The meeting was held from about nine o'clock in the morning until five in the afternoon without intermission, being about eight hours in all.

President Taylor called the meeting to order. He had the Manifesto, that had been prepared under the direction of George Q. Cannon, read over again. Then he put each person under covenant that he or she would defend the principle of Celestial or Plural Marriage, and that they would consecrate their lives, liberty and property to this end, and that they personally would sustain and uphold that principle.

By that time we were all filled with the Holy Ghost. President Taylor and those present occupied about three hours up to this time. After placing us under covenant, he placed his finger on the document, his person rising from the floor about a foot or eighteen inches, and with countenance animated by the Spirit of the Lord, and raising his right hand to the square, he said, "Sign that document,--never! I would suffer my right hand to be severed from my body first. Sanction it,--never! I would suffer my tongue to be torn from its roots in my mouth before I would sanction it!"

After that he talked for about an hour and then sat down and wrote the revelation which was given him by the Lord upon the question of Plural Marriage (which revelation follows this statement). Then he talked to us for some time, and said, "Some of you will be handled and os-[103]tracized and be cast out from the Church by your brethren because of your faithfulness and integrity to this principle, and some of you may have to surrender your lives because of the same, but woe, woe, unto those who shall bring these troubles upon you." (Three of us were handled and ostracized for supporting and sustaining this principle. There are only three left who were at the meeting mentioned--Daniel R. Bateman, George Earl and myself. So far as I know those of them who have passed away all stood firm to the covenants entered into from that day to the day of their deaths.)

After the meeting referred to, President Taylor had L. John Nuttall write five copies of the revelation. He called five of us together: Samuel Bateman, Charles H. Wilkins, George Q. Cannon, John W. Woolley, and myself.

He then set us apart and placed us under covenant that while we lived we would see to it that no year passed by without children being born in the principle of plural marriage. We were given authority to ordain others if necessary to carry this work on, they in turn to be given authority to ordain others when necessary, under the direction of the worthy senior (by ordination), so that there should be no cessation in the work.

He then gave each of us a copy of the Revelation.

I am the only one of the five now living, and so far as I know all five of the brethren remained true and faithful to the covenants they entered into, and to the responsibilities placed upon them at that time.

During the eight hours we were together, and while President Taylor was talking to us, he frequently arose and stood above the floor, and his countenance and being were so enveloped by light and glory that it was difficult for us to look upon him.

He stated that the document, referring to the Manifesto, was from the lower regions. He stated that many of the things he had told us we would forget and they would be [104] taken from us, but that they would return to us in due time as needed, and from this fact we would know that the same was from the Lord. This has been literally fulfilled. Many of the things I forgot, but they are coming to me gradually, and those things that come to me are as clear as on the day on which they were given.

President Taylor said that the time would come when many of the Saints would apostatize because of this principle. He said "one half of this people will apostatize over the principle for which we are now in hiding, yea, and possibly one half of the other half" (rising off the floor while making this statement). He also said the day will come when a document similar to that (Manifesto) then under consideration would be adopted by the Church, following which "apostasy and whoredom would be rampant in the Church."

He said that in the time of the seventh president of this Church, the Church would go into bondage both temporally and spiritually and in that day (the day of bondage) the One Mighty and Strong spoken of in the 85th Section of the Doctrine and Covenants would come.

Among many other things stated by President Taylor on this occasion was this: "I would be surprised if ten percent of those who claim to hold the Melchisedek Priesthood will remain true and faithful to the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the time of the seventh president, and that there would be thousands that think they hold the Priesthood at that time, but would not have it properly conferred upon them."

John Taylor set the five mentioned apart and gave them authority to perform marriage ceremonies, and also to set others apart to do the same thing as long as they remained on the earth; and while doing so, the Prophet Joseph Smith stood by directing the proceedings. Two of us had not met the Prophet Joseph Smith in his mortal lifetime, and we--[105]Charles H. Wilkins and myself--were introduced to him and shook hands with him.

(Signed) LORIN C. WOOLLEY.

Daniel R. Bateman, being present while the above experience was related by Brother Woolley, testified as follows:

I was privileged to be at the meeting of September 27, 1886, spoken of by Brother Woolley, I myself acting as one of the guards for the brethren during those exciting times.

The proceedings of the meeting, as related by Brother Woolley, are correct in every detail. I was not present when the five spoken of by Brother Woolley were set apart for special work, but have on different occasions heard the details of the

same related by both Lorin C. Woolley and John W. Woolley, and from all the circumstances with which I am familiar, I firmly believe the testimony of these two brethren to be true.

(Signed) DANIEL R.

BATEMAN.

STATE OF UTAH. }ss

County of Salt Lake

J. Leslie Broadbent, John Y. Barlow and J. W. Musser, being each duly sworn, on oath, depose and say, that the above and foregoing four pages, constitute a full, true and correct copy of a signed statement of Lorin C. Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman, made in their presence, as the statement purports, September 22, 1929.

J. LESLIE BROADBENT

JOHN Y. BARLOW

J. W. MUSSER

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 4th day of May,
1934.

(Seal)

ANNA M. HILL,

Notary Public of Salt Lake City, Utah

[106] REVELATION TO PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR

Given at the Home of John W. Woolley, Centerville, Utah
September 27, 1886

My son John, you have asked me concerning the New and Everlasting Covenant and how far it is binding upon my people; thus saith the Lord. All commandments that I give must be obeyed by those calling themselves by my name unless they are revoked by me or by my authority, and how can I revoke an everlasting covenant, for I the Lord am everlasting and my everlasting covenants cannot be abrogated nor done away with, but they stand forever.

Have I not given my word in great plainness on this subject? Yet have not great numbers of my people been negligent in the observance of my law and the keeping of my commandments, and yet have I borne with them these many years; and this because of their weakness--because of the perilous times, and furthermore it is more pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters. Nevertheless, I the Lord do not change and my word and my covenants and my law do not, and as I have heretofore said by my servant Joseph: All those who would enter into my glory MUST AND SHALL obey my law. And have I not commanded men that if they were Abraham's seed and would enter into my glory, they must do the works of Abraham? I have not revoked this law, nor will I, for it is everlasting, and those who will enter into my glory must obey the conditions thereof; even so, Amen.

[107] STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT JOHN TAYLOR

As taken from the Salt Lake Tribune of date,
January 6, 1880

"The people of the rest of the country are our enemies. They do not understand us, we do not understand them. We should

pray for them, but we MUST NOT YIELD to them. They think we are foolish, and we think they are foolish; they think we are a pack of rascals, but we have the best of them, for we know they are a pack of rascals. We believe in honesty, morality and purity, in freedom and loyalty to our country; but when they enact TYRANNICAL LAWS, forbidding us the free exercise of our religion, we cannot submit. God is greater than the United States. And when the Government conflicts with Heaven, we will be ranged under the banner of HEAVEN and AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT. The United States says we cannot marry more than one wife. GOD SAYS DIFFERENT. We had no hand in the business; Joseph Smith had no hand in it; Brigham Young had no hand in it. I had no hand in it. It was all the work of God, and HIS LAWS MUST BE OBEYED. If the United States says different the Saints cannot obey it. We do not want to rebel against the United States. Rebellion is not on the program but we will worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience. We want to be friendly with the United States, if the Government will let us, BUT NOT ONE JOT NOR TITLE of our rights will we give up to purchase it. I would like the good God of heaven to prevent them from making laws that we CANNOT KEEP; but when adulterers and libertines pass a law forbidding polygamy the Saints CANNOT OBEY IT. Polygamy is a divine institution. It has been handed down direct from God. The United States CAN NOT ABOLISH IT. No nation on earth can prevent it, NOR ALL THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH COMBINED. I DEFY THE UNITED STATES. I will obey God. These are my sentiments, and all of you who sympathize with me in this position raise your right hands. All hands went up sustaining his position."

Published by
TRUTH PUBLISHING CO.
2157 LINCOLN STREET
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84106

* * *